BERKELEY BAPTIST DIVINITY SCHOOL LIBRARY

THE Mennonite Quarterly Review

BOARD OF EDITORS
HAROLD S. BENDER, *Goshen College*, Editor

Associate Editors

GUY F. HERSHBERGER, *Goshen College*
EDWARD YODER, *Scottdale, Pa.*
C. HENRY SMITH, *Bluffton, Ohio*
CORNELIUS KRAHN, *Hillsboro, Kansas*
JOHN UMBLE, *Goshen College*
ERNST CORRELL, *Washington, D. C.*
ABRAM WARKENTIN, *Newton, Kansas*
JOHN C. WENGER, *Goshen College*

VOLUME XVI JULY, 1942 NUMBER THREE

CONTENTS

EDITORIAL 130

SECULARIZATION AMONG THE MENNONITES OF ELKHART COUNTY, INDIANA 131
Karl Baehr

THE SOCIOLOGICAL AND ECONOMIC SIGNIFICANCE OF THE MENNONITES AS A CULTURE GROUP IN HISTORY 161
Ernst Correll

RURAL LIFE PROBLEMS AND THE MENNONITES 167
Melvin Gingerich

MENNONITE COMMUNITY LIFE IN RUSSIA 174
Cornelius Krahn

A HISTORY OF WINTER BIBLE SCHOOLS IN THE MENNONITE CHURCH (Concluded) 178
Clarence Fretz

EDITORIAL

The growing interest in Mennonite Sociology found expression in a conference on Mennonite Sociology held in Chicago on December 31, 1941. A series of papers were read on a wide range of topics relating to Mennonite life and contemporary problems round the world, but particularly in the United States. While most of these were not scholarly papers of the type usually presented in learned society meetings, all served to sharpen the understanding of essential Mennonite contributions as well as crucial problems in contemporary Mennonite life, and to furnish a most stimulating beginning to what promises to be a movement of great value in the scientific study of Mennonitism. The Review is happy to present in this issue four representative papers from this conference.

The first article represents the major scholarly discussion of the Sociology Conference, namely "Secularization among Mennonites" by Karl Baehr. Mr. Baehr's monograph on this vital subject was too extensive to be read in full hence he gave the conference a digest of his major conclusions. As most representative of this significant study, the Review presents the case study on secularization in one community, the large Mennonite settlement in Elkhart County, Indiana. Mr. Baehr's theme is, that under the impact of the surrounding non-sacred culture, Mennonites tend to adapt themselves gradually to the secular world of which they are a part and thus to lose much of their distinctive heritage. This process of "losing out" has been observed often by thoughtful Mennonites. The sense of danger in this line is very much alive among the more conservative groups, even though a clear analysis of the process is seldom made by the untrained observer. Mr. Baehr has taken this most significant aspect of Mennonite group experience and subjected it to scientific sociological analysis with its precise description and interpretation. It is to be hoped that he will extend his analysis to the whole of Mennonite history, for by so doing he will render a highly needed service to a group which sincerely desires to maintain its heritage and identity in the modern world, but often scarcely knows how to interpret and to meet successfully the tremendous pressures which are upon it.

The remaining papers from the conference published in this issue are briefer and more popular generalizations. The paper by Dr. Ernst Correll on "The Sociological and Economic Significance of the Mennonites as a Cultural Group in History," was the lead-off paper in the conference, designed to give the background of general social and cultural interpretation of Mennonite history which is essential to an understanding of Mennonite sociology. Dr. Correll is the only scholar who has to date clearly set forth the socio-economic aspects of any segment of Mennonite history, as he did in his monograph of 1925 entitled *Das Schweizerische Täufer-Mennonitentum, Ein Soziologischer Bericht.* Correll's material gathered for a similar monograph on the urban-merchant type of Mennonite found in northern Germany in such centers as Crefeld, Emden, Hamburg, and Danzig, still awaits publication. Most fruitful studies of this type on the culturally autonomous Mennonites of Russia, and on the agrarian Mennonites of North America, await the trained young Mennonite scholars of our time who are devoting themselves with increasing comprehension and skill to the intensely interesting and significant issues which arise out of the experience of the Mennonites in attempting to maintain a distinctive way of life in a generally hostile world.

The paper by Dr. Melvin Gingerich, "Rural Life Problems and the Mennonites," sets forth clearly the major current issues in Mennonite rural sociology, and points the way to constructive solution of the most pressing problems.

Dr. Cornelius Krahn highlights the distinctive Mennonite village life of South Russia in a sketch drawn from his own personal acquaintance with that life.

Clarence Fretz's comprehensive history of Winter Bible Schools in the Mennonite Church is concluded in this issue. Of particular value is the summary discussion and the comprehensive statistical table.

THE
Mennonite Quarterly
Review

Vol. XVI No. 3

SECULARIZATION AMONG THE MENNONITES OF ELKHART COUNTY, INDIANA

KARL BAEHR

[Secularization may be defined as the process whereby that which is regarded as sacred (having religious sanction) becomes defined as secular (without religious sanction). It is approximately equivalent to what is meant by the more traditional phrase, "Conformity to the World."]

On the basis of a careful sociological analysis certain conclusions or hypotheses concerning secularization among the Mennonites suggest themselves. These conclusions, in summary, are: (1) The numerous splits among the Mennonites are an evidence of secularization. Such splits have tended to set up a ladder whereby liberalized Mennonites could move from the more conservative to the more liberal* groups and still be called Mennonite. Thus, these splits have also served as agents for preserving the sect. (2) In general, the liberalized Mennonite joins a more liberal branch of Mennonites. Where such is not the case (where a Mennonite joins another denomination) it is usually because no liberal Mennonite church is near, or it is because he married outside the Mennonite group. (3) Liberalization is found to the greatest extent on the fringe of the Mennonite community or in small communities (either rural or urban) with a low degree of isolation. (4) Movement is predomi-

* "Liberal" is used in this study chiefly in the sociological sense, not in the theological sense.

nantly, if not entirely, from the more conservative to the more liberal, i.e., in the direction of the secularization process. Some elements formerly conceived to be sacred become secular, i.e., no longer important. They are, as we shall see, no longer "tests" of membership.

In order to determine the validity of these and other hypotheses, a more detailed study of a Mennonite community was undertaken. The community chosen for study was the Mennonite community in and surrounding Goshen, Indiana. Most of the territory involved lies within Elkhart County. This community was chosen for two major reasons: (1) It is a large Mennonite community close to Chicago, the author's residence, and therefore convenient for study. (2) It represents a community where at least four different groups of Mennonites are to be found. These groups go by stages from the very conservative Old Order Amish to the liberal Central Conference churches.

Plan of Study

The plan of study was to select representative churches from each branch for investigation. Comparison between the groups could thus be made. Further selection of the churches was made to include a rural and an urban church from each branch, with the exception of the two Amish branches, which have no urban churches. In this manner comparisons between the urban and rural churches in the same branch could be made and these differences, in turn, compared with the other branches.

The churches chosen and the reasons for their choice follow:

1. No problem was present in selecting the two Central Conference Mennonite churches. Only two such churches are located in the immediate community, one rural and the other urban. Although these churches are the most liberal of the Mennonite churches, they are of Amish background.

2. Among the (Old) Mennonites two rural churches were selected: These two churches represent entirely different backgrounds. One is composed of members who have been (Old) Mennonites for many generations. The other is made up of Amish Mennonites—i.e., people from Amish background. From the middle of the last century up until the early years of the present century, these Amish Mennonites gradually liberalized and drifted away from their Amish brethren. Finally they joined the (Old) Mennonite church by con-

ferences. Certain differences will be observed between these groups. The urban church selected is the only distinctly urban (Old) Mennonite church in the area.

3. The Conservative Amish have one church in the area with two meetinghouses (churches). Both are rural. They of course are of Old Order Amish Background.

4. Among the Old Order Amish one cannot speak of churches. They meet in the homes of their members. Consequently, their churches are referred to as districts. The districts are named, or they are known by the name of the bishop presiding. One district was selected for this study.

These are the four major groups. Another group of Mennonites in the area might be mentioned because they are very different from the foregoing. This group is the Mennonite Brethren in Christ Church. Socially they are liberal, having no dress requirements. However, theologically they are fundamentalist and are more closely related to the Free Methodists and the Plymouth Brethren in doctrine than to the orthodox Mennonites. In fact, the majority of their members are of non-Mennonite background.

Mennonite Principles

In order that significant comparisons might be drawn between these various groups of Mennonites, it would seem necessary to describe in somewhat more detail the doctrines and practices of the church as they have developed during the centuries, and were fixed several generations ago. Without going into certain minor exceptions caused by early divisions, the following are the fundamental doctrines and practices of the Mennonites at that early date:

1. Their theology was conservative or orthodox. They believed in the literal inspiration of the Bible and held it as the final authority for all thoughts and action. They singled out the New Testament and particularly the Sermon on the Mount for their creed.

2. Each local church was to be a "communion of saints" with its own congregational government. Each congregation chose its own ministers, deacons, and bishop.

3. The ministers, deacons, and bishops* were chosen by lot for life. They received no financial remuneration.

* The term "Bishop" is not to be confused with the Episcopal system of church government. The Mennonite bishop is the church functionary who alone is responsible for the ministration of the church sacraments of communion and feet-washing, of baptism and ordination. The ministers preach (the bishop also) and assist the bishop in these special functions.

4. They practiced the ban (excommunication) and the avoidance. The avoidance called for a disciplined refusal on the part of the members to eat with or to accept kindnesses from the banned person. This severe form of social pressure was also to be observed between husband and wife. A number of divisions occurred over this avoidance doctrine. This doctrine was limited to the Amish and was not found among the other (Swiss) Mennonites, of whom the Elkhart County Mennonites are descendants.

5. Opposition to the taking of oaths was strictly practiced.

6. The renunciation of violence and the acceptance of the doctrine of nonresistance was one of the major principles.

7. Obedience to government as an ordinance of God was prescribed, except where it demanded the taking of life or the swearing of oaths. This led to a prohibition of taking government offices because such offices required the use of the oath and participation in judging and condemning of life.

8. They believed in adult baptism only; baptism must be upon confession of faith.

9. They were opposed to all secret orders, such as lodges.

10. The doctrine of the simple life was prescribed. This was prompted by the Biblical injunction to be separated from the world, which was evil. Consequently, the members were to dress plainly. In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries in America, that meant for the women a black bonnet, prayer headcovering, and apron, and for the men a plain coat, black hat (usually broad brim), and beards (Amish only). No mustaches were tolerated because they symbolized the military; army men usually wore them. Indulgence in worldly pleasures and finery was proscribed.

11. The custom of mutual aid was a basic teaching based on love, and was most in evidence in times of distress. The church accepted responsibility for the welfare of all its members.

12. Marriage outside the group was not tolerated.

13. Secular courts were not to be used. Differences were to be settled before the church or privately or with the help of the minister.

These principles are no longer all adhered to by the various groups. Today they are variously held and variously interpreted.

We shall now deal with the groups found in and around Goshen, giving a brief summary of their history and of their present doctrines and manner of living.

Histories of the Selected Churches

Old Order Amish.—The Amish church had its beginnings in Switzerland and Alsace in the year 1693. Jacob Ammann, founder of the group, was a bishop in the Mennonite Church in Alsace. He noticed that according to his standards, most of the ministers were growing lax in discipline, and did not practice avoidance. They were only denying the excommunicated members the privilege of coming to the communion table and not the daily table as well. [The Swiss never practiced avoidance as did the Dutch Mennonites.] After an investigation of the conditions in Switzerland and Alsace, Ammann and his associates called those who were lax to appear before them and answer charges. When they did not appear, Ammann banned them. These ministers, in turn, disowned Ammann and his group. Ammann further intensified the doctrine of nonconformity and separation from the world. Later efforts to unite the Amish and the Mennonites failed. Some of the Amish followed the Mennonites to settle in Pennsylvania about 1740, settling in Lancaster and Berks County, Pennsylvania. From there they spread to other places, including Ohio and Indiana.

It was in the year 1842 that the Amish came to the Elkhart County area, settling east of Goshen. A leading Amish bishop said his father arrived just one hundred years ago from Somerset County, Pennsylvania. The bishop's wife's parents came from Holmes County, Ohio. The Amish community east of Elkhart grew quite rapidly until about 1880-1890, when many moved west to Iowa and Kansas. Then, twenty-five years ago many Amish began to come back from the West, and the settlement grew rapidly. Some settled west of Goshen around Nappanee. Over these years the Amish have grown from one district (congregation) to sixteen districts comprising approximately five hundred families.

It can be said that the Old Order Amish are the most conservative branch of Mennonites (with the exception of the Hutterites, who often are not classified as Mennonites). They were a minority group when they broke away from the main Mennonite stream and have remained a minority group—though a growing one. The majority of the Mennonites certainly never were as conservative as the Amish were and are today. The Amish rigorously hold to the plain dress—long blue or dark muslin dresses with large white aprons and dark bonnets for the women, and black suits, large broad-brimmed hats,

and beards for the men. Only hooks and eyes are allowed—no buttons are tolerated on coats and vests. They use no modern technological devices, but use horses and buggies for transportation, and farm with the simple horse-drawn farm machinery. They retain the German language in worship. More will be said about them later. This group has about 12,000 baptized members in the United States.

Conservative Amish—The Conservative Amish are next on the scale of liberalism. They gradually grew apart from the Old Order Amish on a number of points. In the course of time they erected meetinghouses (church buildings) and gave up the practice of meeting in the homes of the members. They came to take a more active interest in Sunday schools and finally sponsored them. They became more interested in benevolent enterprises and missions and held Bible conferences. They came to tolerate both English and German at their various functions and also began to hold services every Sunday. In 1912 they held their first conference at Grantsville, Maryland. They are a small group in America, having a membership in 1942 of about 3,500 baptized members. The Conservative Amish dress very much like the Old Order Amish.* They permit the use of electricity, automobiles, tractors, and other modern appliances. The Conservative Amish are usually found in and around an Old Order Amish settlement.

The Conservative Amish congregation in Elkhart County (Town Line) was established in 1874. It broke away from the Forks Church (now an (Old) Mennonite Church). The members of Town Line remained conservative and those of the Forks Church became more liberal. In 1912 the Town Line and its branch the Greiner Church joined the Conservative Amish Conference. The Town Line and the Greiner Churches grew rather slowly until 1915. They lost a number of families in 1905 and 1906 when the "Sleeping Preacher" came through Indiana. From 1915 to 1923 the churches saw a rapid growth. Cars were becoming popular, and this resulted in quite a movement from the Old Order Amish to the Conservatives, who tolerated their use. This movement slowed up after 1923. At present the Conservatives have 335 members (excluding children). Of that number at least 10 per cent were formerly members of the Old Order Amish church. Of course, the entire congregation

* Around Goshen they are called "Pinky Amish" because they tolerate brighter colored aprons.

DIVINITY SCHOOL
LIBRARY

is of Amish background—i.e., their parents or grandparents were members of the Old Order.

(*Old*) *Mennonite churches.*—The (Old) Mennonite church represents the main body of Mennonites. It is really *the* Mennonite church. When the Amish split occurred in 1693, it was the body that adhered to the more liberal interpretation. The Swiss Mennonites, from whom they descend, never did, and does not now, practice the "avoidance," though it does excommunicate for gross sins. The practice of dress restrictions is adhered to, though the restrictions are not as severe as among the Amish. The women dress simply. The bonnet and the prayer headcovering are required, though not uniformly maintained. The men wear no beards and dress in ordinary suits. The ministers wear the plain coat (no collar) that buttons up to the top.

The (Old) Mennonites are active in the various fields of missions, education, publication, and philanthropy. They were largely instrumental in the founding of the Mennonite Central Committee, which is a united committee of all Mennonite branches organized in 1920 to help relieve the famine among the Russian Mennonites. It later assisted Russian Mennonite refugees to settle in America. Today this committee also operates the Mennonite Civilian Public Service Camps established for Conscientious Objectors under the Selective Service Act. The (Old) Mennonite church is the largest single body of Mennonites in America and in the world. In America its total membership is over 55,000.

In brief, the histories of the three (Old) Mennonite churches selected for study follow:

The rural church east of Goshen is located five miles southeast of Middlebury in Lagrange County. The church began as a split from the Old Order Amish about the year 1857 over the matter of baptism. The dissenters became convinced that baptism should take place in a stream of running water, although the church has since given up the practice. The dissatisfied group also was interested in building a church house. However, they met in various homes until 1864, when a church building was erected.

The bishop of the church explained to the writer that the rigid Old Order Amish restrictions were *gradually* dropped. There was no real resistance. "I was the first minister in the congregation not to wear the beard. Nobody requested that I wear it." The dropping of the rigid dress restrictions made them more nearly like the (Old)

Mennonites except that they had gone even farther than the Mennonites and had no dress requirements. This caused a little difficulty when the church united with the (Old) Mennonites, who emphasized the plain coat. They had let go the hooks and eyes because they felt that dress was unimportant. Now they had to adopt a new form of restriction. However, this tension soon passed and all conform to the doctrines and practices of the (Old) Mennonite Church. This group also adopted Sunday schools quite early, about 1890. For many years they kept up the practice of holding services every other Sunday. In about the year 1885 they began meeting each Sunday. This church now has about 250 members.

A church west of Goshen is the other rural (Old) Mennonite church selected for study. It is located about seven miles west of Goshen. No Amish live near this community. This church was the first (Old) Mennonite church in Elkhart County. The earliest Mennonite settlers arrived in 1843. First services were held in a schoolhouse in 1848 with sixteen present. The following year a log meetinghouse was built. In 1861 a frame building was erected. It now is used by the Old Order Mennonites (not Amish) who split away from the church in 1871 because the main group was becoming too liberal for them. During the first twenty years, five daughter congregations were organized out of this church. In 1871 the Old Order Mennonite division took place and in 1873 the "Brenneman division" occurred. Today this church has about 275 members.

One urban church was selected. The coming of Mennonites to this urban community centered around the publishing business established by John F. Funk, a lumber dealer of Chicago—a Mennonite. He began to publish the *Herald of Truth* in 1864 in Chicago, then moved to this community in 1867. The publishing business expanded and later became the Mennonite Publishing Company. For a number of years the Mennonites in the city went to the country churches. In 1870, however, preaching services were commenced in the homes of the Mennonites in the city. Within a few months a lot was purchased and in 1871 a church house was dedicated. The building was enlarged in 1895 and again in 1901. A large new church was built in 1932. The present membership is about 375. Families are coming from a wide area to the city for jobs. Two missions have already been established by the church. Their membership is included in the above figure.

Central Conference churches.—The Central Conference churches represent the liberal group. When the Western District Conference of the Amish Mennonite churches was formed in 1893, a number of Amish congregations in Central Illinois refrained from joining because they felt the requirements of membership were too rigid. They had moved even farther away from their Amish traditions. Consequently these congregations remained unaffiliated for some years. In 1899 they organized a conference which has met annually since. They are active in foreign and home mission work (having two missions in Chicago), publications, education (supporting Bluffton College, Ohio, a General Conference Mennonite College), and benevolences and relief. They have no dress restrictions other than the principle to dress simply. Theologically they are more liberal than the (Old) Mennonite church as a whole. The Central Conference is a very small body, claiming only about 3,500 members.

The rural church of this Conference grew out of an Amish Mennonite Church. Both churches are located about four miles east of Goshen. The split occurred over the dress question. In 1892, approximately fifty members were banned from the Amish Mennonite church because they refused to accept the restrictions of bonnets and beards. The new congregation began with fifty-one charter members. In the summer of 1892 they built their church building. In 1898 this group joined the General Conference Mennonites of North America. However, in 1911 a new minister accepted the call to the church on condition that the church join the Central Conference. This was done. A factor causing the change was that the Central Conference prescribed feetwashing as one of the services, whereas the General Conference tolerated the communion service with or without the feetwashing service. The new pastor felt that it should be prescribed.

The urban church, selected from the Central Conference, was organized in 1913. A number of the rural Central Conference members had moved to town and felt the need of starting a church in the city. A dwelling house was purchased and remodeled for a church house. The minister of the rural church became pastor of the new urban church, which had fifteen charter members. The church was quick to adopt Sunday school, Ladies' Aid Society, and Christian Endeavor. It grew rapidly and by 1919 a new brick building was erected. When the church was dedicated, sixty members belonged. The greatest growth took place between 1924 and 1926. At that

time a wholesale purging of the liberal element in a near-by (Old) Mennonite church took place. About 150 members withdrew and joined the Central Conference church. The membership of the church today is about 290, of which 30 are inactive.

This urban church is not a typical Central Conference church in one respect; the majority of its members are of (Old) Mennonite background rather than Amish. However, it must be said that the Central Conference churches today are tending more and more to be composed of Mennonites from several branches. They form a rallying point for the liberals of the more conservative churches. It should also be said that this urban church is perhaps the most liberal of the Central Conference churches and one of the most liberal among all the churches of the liberal Mennonite church conferences. Considerable difference exists between the urban church and its mother rural church. These comparisons will become more clear in the material to follow.

Comparative Study

Now that a general picture of the branches of Mennonites dealt with has been presented, together with a brief history of each church selected from each group, we must turn our attention to the modifications of their church doctrines and practices. This can best be done by comparing the various churches.

Excommunication and Avoidance.—Both the Old Order Amish and the Conservative Amish have retained the use of the ban and the avoidance, the Old Order being more strict. However, in both groups it is used only for gross sins (adultery, fornication, stealing) or for wilful and stubborn refusal to obey the rules of the church. For minor offenses they are first admonished by the minister or bishop, then "set back from communion," and only as a last resort are they excommunicated and avoided. In both the Old Order Amish and the Conservative Amish this final act of expulsion has seldom been used. The bishop of the Old Order Amish, and the bishop of the Conservative Amish, say that the offending party most frequently comes to the minister or bishop and confesses and asks forgiveness. Thus, if excommunication is required, as for some gross sin, the act merely becomes a formality and the individual is immediately received back into the fellowship. Of those that have been excommunicated the majority have repented and returned to the fellowship. Some have stayed outside the fellowship for as long as a year or two.

Those who do not come back go to other Mennonite groups or remain unaffiliated with any church. The Old Order Amish tend to find fellowship with the Conservative Amish or the (Old) Mennonites. The Conservative Amish go to the (Old) Mennonites.

The more moderate group of Mennonites, which characterizes the (Old) Mennonite churches, use the excommunication but not the avoidance. From the records gleaned from the various churches in each branch, the conclusion can be drawn that the (Old) Mennonite churches have used the excommunication somewhat more frequently than the conservative groups just discussed. They have also been somewhat less successful in bringing the excommunicated persons back into the fellowship for they tend to join other churches. In some cases they join non-Mennonite churches and in other cases more liberal Mennonite churches. Those at the east-of-Goshen rural church tend to join either non-Mennonite churches or the Central Conference churches, or to remain unaffiliated. Those from the west-of-Goshen rural church tend to join the more liberal Mennonite Brethren in Christ church, which is located near by, or to remain unaffiliated. All of the (Old) Mennonite churches, including the urban church, use excommunication for not complying with dress restrictions, though the use of the bonnet is no longer a "test" of membership. The prayer headcovering, however, is a test. These in the city church tend to use the bonnet to a lesser degree than the rural churches. At the same time they show the greatest number of excommunications. This probably indicates the secularizing influence of the city upon the sacred doctrine and practices of the (Old) Mennonites.

Among the liberal churches of the Central Conference excommunication has not been used. Instead, the church tends to grow lax in enforcing the doctrines and practices of the church. In the rural church the communion is not denied to anyone. As the minister of this church, who has served the church as pastor since 1913 (with the exception of a few years), expressed the matter, "I always stressed communion as a personal matter—a time for self-examination. For if a person 'eateth and drinketh unworthily' he condemns himself." Even cases of gross sin are not brought before the church, as is the case among the Amish and the (Old) Mennonites, because "we don't want to bring such things before the young in the church." Instead, the minister and deacon go to the person directly. If he desires to become a member in good standing he must come in "under confession," i.e., he must sign a statement of confession and repentance. Such cases, however, have been very rare.

In the urban church the discipline is even more lax. While at the rural church the doctrines and practices of the church are being maintained, at the urban church definite adaptations have taken place. Though the observance of the feetwashing service is required by the church, many no longer are devoted to the service so that it has become optional. About fifteen to twenty per cent do not take part in that service. Like the other Mennonite churches, this church is strictly opposed, in doctrine, to secret societies, but in its congregation are several lodge members, including the Master of the Masonic lodge, and people are quick to point it out. Thus, belonging to secret orders is neither being condemned or condoned, but ignored. It is not being used as a test of membership, though if a different minister were called, it might. The present minister feels that greater harm would be done by making an issue of these violations of the church doctrines and practices. However, he does openly advocate the feetwashing service. Both rural and urban churches lost no members because of discipline.

The urban Mennonite Brethren in Christ church, which we have described as a possible fifth type of Mennonites, uses the ban or excommunication. Its minister put the matter thus: "We warn them to get back to the Lord. If they still do not show any interest I recommend that they be put on probation for one year. During that year they are again notified and if they still refuse to respond they are dropped from the list. This occurs when they don't attend out of neglect, for smoking, drinking, going to the movies, dancing, playing cards, or some other sin." This form of discipline is quite different from the other Mennonite churches. Although, with the exception of the urban Central Conference church, the other groups do not approve of smoking, etc., no big issue is made of the matter, since it does not seem to be a problem with the most of the Mennonite groups. Some exceptions will be noted later.

From this comparative study of discipline one can see that the most conservative group—the Old Order Amish—has maintained both the discipline and the doctrines. The moderate group, represented by the (Old) Mennonites, has tended to compromise a bit upon practice (allowing the dress matter to slide somewhat) while at the same time making freer use of the discipline of excommunication in an effort to preserve the discipline and the doctrines. This fact seemed to be most pronounced in the urban church. Among the liberal group the tendency has been to drop the discipline and com-

promise on the doctrine. Here, then, we have three levels of discipline and practice. The direction of the movement of members indicates that adaptations have been taking place toward the relaxing of discipline and the compromising of doctrines. This fact is most noticeable in the liberal urban church (liberal both theologically and socially) of the Central Conference.

This point, however, must not be given too much weight, for the Amish have been holding their members better in the last fifteen years than they did earlier in the century when cars, etc., were becoming popular. The (Old) Mennonite Church is also holding more firmly than it did twenty years ago. That has been explained by their growing interest in missions, publications, and relief. These vital problems have served to take their minds off matters of dress—to a degree, at least—and make them cognizant of graver matters. It is quite possible that the stunning effect of the persecution of the Mennonites of Russia and the campaign to bring relief to them was one of the greatest factors in stabilizing the life of the (Old) Mennonite Church. Greater interest in education also served as an outlet for the energies of the restless young people. These, of course, are accommodations and as such are compromises in the direction of secularization—which, in this case (as opposed to the end result of secularization as it is found in highly individualized urban areas) has served to give greater strength and solidarity to the church.

Activities and Programs.—Again the Old Order Amish have held closest to their traditional church services. Their entire round of activities is practically the same as it was two hundred years ago. They have preaching services every other Sunday and meet at the homes of the members in rotation. The service starts at nine o'clock in the morning and lasts until twelve. After dinner is served to the congregation by the host to the church, the buggies begin to file home. This is usually at about two or three o'clock. The services are unique. They have no musical instruments and sing their difficult chorals without notes and by ear. The congregation kneels for silent prayer or for a read prayer; no spoken prayers are ever used. They usually have two short sermons and one main sermon and lengthy readings from the Scripture. In the evening the young people come together for a "sing." The service is not considered a religious service, though only hymns are sung. In a few districts they have Sunday school during the summer. This is an innovation. The German language is used.

The Conservative Amish have departed from the Amish church routine. They have Sunday school at nine o'clock and church service at ten forty-five every Sunday. They meet in church buildings, have no musical instruments, and follow a simple order of service—singing of chorals, Scripture reading, and preaching. In the evening they have Young People's Meeting. The Women's Sewing Circle meets during the week. The German language is still used, though, as the bishop put it, "it is going the other way now."

The (Old) Mennonite churches have even more services. The urban church has the greatest number of services and activities. The east-of-Goshen rural church has the following services: Teachers' meeting, 9:00; Sunday school, 9:30; preaching service, 10:30; Young People's Meeting, 7:30 P.M.; on special occasions, preaching following Young People's Meeting; monthly meeting of Sewing Circle; annual meeting. The west-of-Goshen rural church has devotional exercises at 9:15; Sunday school, 9:30; preaching service at 10:30; Young People's Meeting at 7:30 P.M. every other Sunday; occasional preaching service in the evening; monthly meeting of Sewing Circle; monthly meeting of Literary Society (mostly young people); chorus practice (the chorus gives a program in the fall and then disbands); Bible study class in winter; occasional trustee meeting; annual business meeting. The urban church, in addition to the foregoing, has a regular preaching service Sunday evening at 8:00; Wednesday evening prayer meeting; Women's Missionary Society meeting monthly; Junior Girls' Sewing Circle meeting monthly; official annual business meeting and a fall business meeting for the Sunday school; monthly meeting of the trustees; also a number of committees that meet occasionally; Benefit Committee (to help poor and sick), Missions Committee, Young People's Committee, monthly meeting of Literary Society.

The order of service in the (Old) Mennonite churches is simple. They permit no musical instruments in the church service. The chorister leads the singing. They sing the Gospel hymns as well as the chorals. These hymns the Old Order Amish dare not sing in their services, but the young people can sing them in their singing services. The (Old) Mennonites use the spoken prayers exclusively. The women all wear the prayer headcovering and most of them wear the bonnets.

Among the liberal churches the number of services differ quite radically between the rural Central Conference church and the urban

Central Conference church. The former has about the same number of services as the rural (Old) Mennonite church. However, it has preaching service at 10:00 and Sunday school following at 11:00. Thus, the rural church has considerably fewer services than the urban church of the (Old) Mennonites. On the other hand, the urban Central Conference church has approximately the same number of services as the urban (Old) Mennonite church. The list of its services follows: Sunday school at 10:00; morning worship service at 11:00; Christian Endeavor at 6:30 P.M.; evening worship at 7:30; first Monday of each month is official Board Meeting; second Monday of each month is Mothers' Club; third Monday of each month is Witmarsum (Junior Mission Society); third Wednesday of each month is Sewing Society; every Wednesday night is choir practice; third Friday of each month is Senior Women's Missionary Society; second Tuesday of each March, June, September, and December is the quarterly business meeting; annual meeting is in June (final authority for decisions rests in the quarterly meeting). This church has no Wednesday night prayermeeting.

The order of service is more formal among the liberal churches. They permit the use of musical instruments in church, which adds to the dignity and formality of the service. Their order of service is more elaborate. This is particularly true of the urban church. It prints a bulletin with an order of service, etc., just as many other denominations.

The conclusion to be drawn from this comparison is that there tends to be an expanding number of services and functions from the more conservative groups to the more liberal groups and also from the more rural to the urban within the same group. This would tend to indicate that as the church becomes more liberal and more urban it accommodates itself more and more to the type and range of services and functions found in other denominations. It would be very difficult for the average person to notice any difference between the worship service of the urban Central Conference church and the Presbyterian or Methodist service. The chances are he would never dream that he had been in a Mennonite church. This would be less true in the rural Central Conference church and still less true in the urban (Old) Mennonite church, and still more differences would be noted as one proceeded down to the Old Order Amish services. Again a ladder of liberalization (secularization) is to be noted.

Place and Function of the Minister.—Among the Old Order

Amish the ministers, deacons, and bishops are chosen by lot—i.e., the names of all those having received two or more votes by the congregation are placed in the lot, and the one drawn becomes the minister, deacon, or bishop, whichever is up for election. These officials are chosen for life and serve without pay. Among the Old Order Amish all are farmers and gain their livelihood in that capacity. Being selected as a minister is a heavy responsibility, and every Amishman takes it very seriously. Upon being received into the church every young man must agree to assume the burdens of minister, deacon, or bishop should God choose him, and every young woman must consent to bear the burdens the wife of such functionaries must bear. The reward given the one chosen is one of status and position. He is thought well of in the eyes of the community and his word bears weight. His word is accepted not only in what we would term religious matters, but also in the realm of social behavior and economic life. A minister or bishop might admonish a member for improper use of his land—for the land is a trust from God—or for any sharp business deal. Any behavior that is outside the set of conventional understandings is subject to the authority of the minister or bishop.

The above is also true for the Conservative Amish, though to a lesser degree. They have tolerated sufficient innovations in customs and practices so that it is a little more difficult to define just what is permitted and what is prohibited. Their ministers are chosen the same way, receive no salary, and serve for life.

Among the (Old) Mennonites the ministers and bishops are chosen in the same manner as the above, except that the lot is not always used. They, too, are chosen for life and serve without stipulated financial aid, although increasingly partial support is given. The majority of the rural ministers farm. The minister of the urban church earns his living by working in a store. However, his church is moving in the direction of some remuneration, in that it has a parsonage which may be used by the minister free of rent, and some money donations are made. The other ministers receive a token of appreciation from the congregation when once a year a large number of men come to their farms and do up a lot of their work. This practice is also common among the Amish. The (Old) Mennonite ministers also have great influence beyond the range of their immediate church obligations. They are respected as the leaders of the community. Since the Mennonites do not look to civil government or other organizations for favors or help, they quite naturally accept

the words of their ministers as authority. He is the leader of the church and of the community in which his church members live. In all of these Mennonite groups, thus, a sort of theocracy is in practice. This fact tends to be modified in the urban areas where the membership is scattered over the city and engaged in many different occupations. Even here a great amount of control is exercised. Mennonite laborers may not join unions. If no agreements can be made with the unions by the ministers (it is significant that the minister sees the union leaders), whereby Mennonites may be exempt from membership, they quit their jobs and seek employment elsewhere.

Among the liberal churches the function and place of the minister is somewhat different. He is no longer chosen by lot but is extended a "call" by the congregation. He is hired for an indefinite tenure, usually five years to begin with, and for three year terms thereafter. He is paid a salary. In the rural church over $800 was paid to the last minister, although the one who preceded him as minister received no salary. The church expects to pay more to the new minister whom they are in the process of seeking. One minister supplemented his income by raising chickens, having a cow and some pigs and a large garden.

The urban church has always paid a considerable salary to its minister. The present minister receives over $1,500 and parsonage. The payment of a salary makes the job of the minister a profession to be differentiated from other professions. He is a specialist among specialists. Consequently, he no longer has the place and function that is found among the unsalaried ministers of the other groups. He no longer feels free or competent to deal with matters outside his field—special business matters, etc. He is not dealing with a closely knit body of conventional understandings but with a range of accepted practices. His members are in every line of occupation, business, and profession.

Undoubtedly one of the significant reasons this minister does not feel like upsetting the church by trying to enforce the rule for the practice of feetwashing by each member and the rule against secret societies is that those members are after all contributing to his salary. He may not be conscious of such a thought or influence, but that it must have some bearing in causing him to feel that other matters are more important (more sacred) cannot be denied. Thus, in a very real sense in the liberal churches the minister becomes the follower of the congregation (he comes to accept or tolerate what they

accept) instead of the congregation following his divine leadership. Perhaps this point has been carried too far, but it would seem that the professional status of the minister opens the door to a more secularized ministry where the great function of the minister is to deliver a "good sermon" which the members may intellectually approve but be under no obligation to put into practice.

The Mennonite Brethren in Christ minister receives the free-will offering each Sunday as his salary. Thus, he is not receiving a stipulated salary and is, consequently, more able to enforce the doctrines and rules of the church. This, however, is not a typical Mennonite practice. The minister is ordained by the conference and is stationed by the Stationing Committee of the conference—a semi-Episcopal system. Again, this is Methodist and not Mennonite practice.

It would appear, then, that the more liberal the group becomes the more limited and restricted the functions of the minister become. It would appear also that this process is found to be of greatest significance in the urban churches, particularly of the Central Conference where no rules of dress help to hold the members to the doctrine of separation from the world, and the payment of a salary stimulates the further acceptance of the standards and conventional understandings of the world.

Church Property and Finances.—The Old Order Amish have no church property and no expenses of upkeep. Their only financial obligation comes when each member has to pay his share (according to the evaluation of his property) to rebuild a brother's barn or home which was destroyed by fire or storm, or some benevolent project. The Amish churches contribute to war sufferers' relief. Their quota toward the payment of the expenses of the C.P.S. camps has been paid promptly. The entire sum was raised in one collection. They support no missions.

The Conservative Amish have two church buildings valued at approximately eight or nine thousand dollars. They have the expense of upkeep, and the janitor is given one hundred dollars a year. Each family is assessed a certain amount by the trustees for the upkeep of the church. Not all pay that. They have no regular offerings in church—neither do the Old Order Amish. Their Sunday-school offerings go toward the relief work of the Mennonite Central Committee. They support an orphanage and mission in Flint, Michigan. Otherwise they support no mission projects.

The (Old) Mennonite churches all have church buildings. The

rural buildings are valued at approximately $15,000. The urban church is valued at between $40,000 and $50,000. It is a better building and less severely plain. All three churches pay an annual fee of $150 to the janitor. Money for benevolences is raised by free-will offerings, but church expense is raised by assessment. Offerings are not taken every Sunday. All three churches are active in raising funds for missions and relief. Since none of the churches keep good records, none of the ministers could venture a figure for their total benevolence and relief giving. One rural church estimated $3,000 a year. If that is reasonably accurate, this church is giving approximately eleven dollars per member per year for missions and relief—a very high figure.

The Central Conference churches also show a great difference between urban and rural churches. The rural church is valued at approximately $6,000, while the urban church is valued at around $50,000. The latter is a brick structure with a modern kitchen in the basement, a number of Sunday-school rooms, and a chapel whose chancel can be converted into a stage for plays. It is equipped to show movies and has a rheostat for control of the lighting. Both churches pay for the services of a janitor and for upkeep. Their budgets (these churches have budgets) are raised through contributions. The envelope system is used. The total budget of the rural church is $2,656. Of this $1,356 or fifty-one per cent goes for missions or relief. This amounts to $7.50 per person for relief and missions and an equal amount for church maintenance. The total budget of the urban church for last year was $4,407. Of that sum $1,365 went for relief and missions or benevolences. This figure amounts to thirty-one per cent of the total budget and represents a contribution of $4.75 per member to such mission and relief work. Each member gives another $10.50 to general church maintenance.

These figures would indicate that the very conservative groups have few expenses and give very little toward the support of relief and philanthropy, while the moderate churches—the (Old) Mennonites—give an overwhelming proportion of the money raised toward relief, missions, and philanthropy (the proportion is so great partly because they do not pay their ministers), and give a greater proportion to church maintenance than do the very conservative. The more liberal the church the greater amount of money is required for operating expenses and the less is given toward relief and philanthropy. The statement can also be made that the urban churches

have more expensive plants and have higher operating expenses and give proportionately less for relief, missions, and philanthropy. This is well characterized by the difference between operating expenses and philanthropic giving found to exist between the rural and urban Central Conference churches. Such figures would again indicate a drift toward secularization. However, it must be said that the amount given toward missions and philanthropy by the most liberal urban Mennonite church far exceeds that given by the average urban church of other denominations (excluding the Nazarenes and certain other Holiness churches).

Membership.—A doctrine that all of the churches maintain is adult baptism. The child is admitted to church membership upon confession of faith and baptism. The ages at which children (adults) have been taken in as members have been progressively reduced. Many years ago the age was normally about twenty years. The Old Order Amish have held most closely to that age level. The average age for the baptism and admission into church membership for the Amish girls is from fifteen to seventeen; for Amish boys it is from eighteen to twenty. Before baptism these converts are given several weeks of instruction, before Sunday services, in the faith and practices of the church. This has always been the practice.

Among the Conservative Amish the same procedure is observed, but the average age of admission is lower, from thirteen to seventeen, except when young people come to them from the Old Order Amish—then the age is nineteen to twenty.

There is apparently no significant difference between the (Old) Mennonite churches and the Central Conference churches with reference to the age of baptism and admission into church membership. All accept children as young as ten. The only difference would seem to exist between the rural and the urban churches. The tendency is for the rural churches to have a few more converts ranging in age up to seventeen. The urban churches have few if any above fourteen years of age. Each church also gives several weeks of instruction to the converts before baptism. The urban Central Conference church, the most liberal church, gives the longest period of instruction—from ten to twelve weeks. All of the other churches instruct for about six weeks. The urban Central Conference church is the only church to make use of the term "catechetical instruction." The Mennonite Brethren in Christ church accepts people at any age—whenever converted, which is substantially the practice of the (Old) Mennonite churches.

The ages at which the young people begin to assume responsibility in church offices and duties is directly related to the number of activities found in the church. Those churches, notably the (Old) Mennonite and the Central Conference churches, which place an emphasis upon Sunday school and young people's activities, have more young people taking places of leadership. Some at the age of eighteen become Sunday-school superintendents, though that is rare. Among both Amish groups actual church jobs are limited to married men and usually to men over forty years of age. In the other churches a man might become a deacon or minister at a much earlier age; occasionally, Amish men are ordained quite young.

In summary, then, it would appear that in general the more liberal the group the earlier the children are admitted into church membership. And the more activities the church maintains, the more young people accept places of leadership.

Membership in Outside Organizations.—All the churches in each branch of Mennonites prohibit membership in any secret society. The only church that has not enforced that ruling has been the liberal urban Central Conference church. All the other churches make that a "test" of membership. All, except the two Central Conference churches, prohibit or discourage belonging to Lions Clubs, Rotary Clubs, etc. Several in the urban Central Conference church belong, though it is interesting that the minister has never been invited to join any of these organizations.

A different practice is maintained with reference to belonging to and participating in the Farm Bureau. Among the Old Order Amish, belonging is strictly prohibited and a member would be subject to discipline. Among the Conservative Amish and the (Old) Mennonites, membership is strictly discouraged, but it is not made a "test" of membership. Few of these groups belong. Those who belong are "not active members," so spoke a minister of one rural church. Among the liberal churches, membership in the Farm Bureau is more likely to be encouraged, not by the ministers but by members in the congregation. Several of the members have high offices in the Indiana Farm Bureau Organization in Goshen.

When it comes to patronizing the Farm Bureau, all of the Mennonite groups are active. Even the Amish purchase the commodities because they like the quality. The (Old) Mennonites also purchase the commodities. Both groups are aware of the fact that the patronage dividends on their purchases accumulate until they amount to

enough to pay the membership fee in the Farm Bureau. The Amish, however, do not recognize that membership. The Farm Bureau does. A number of Amishmen have more than one hundred dollars of patronage dividend lying in the Bureau. Sometimes the family accepts the money after the head of the family passes away. The (Old) Mennonites tend to accept the patronage refund and to that extent are "passive" members. The liberal church members of the Central Conference churches not only patronize but assume places of leadership. One member is a bookkeeper, another sells Farm Bureau insurance, another is assistant manager.

It would seem, in conclusion, that the more liberal the group the more they tend to participate in the organizations of "the world." It is an evidence of the progressive breakdown of the "conflict group." They are not only accepted by the world but are invited to join and participate in such organizations. This tends to make the groups feel more at home in the outside world and by feeling at home they become participants in the life of that world. Whether such participation will mean that gradually the members will appreciate and adopt all the conventional understandings of the larger society, i.e., secularizing more and more of the doctrines and practices of the Mennonites, remains to be seen. Certainly this present drift is in that direction, though their principles and practices are with few exceptions remarkably intact.

Education.—With reference to education, the division is between the two Amish groups, and the moderate and liberal groups. The former discourage education. "The wisdom of man is foolishness in the eyes of God." None of the children in the Old Order Amish go to school beyond the sixteen-year age required. Some are able to get a year or two of high school, but when they reach sixteen, they quit. Among the Conservative Amish this is also the general practice, but a few have finished high school. Several have also taken short-term courses at Goshen College, the largest (Old) Mennonite college in America. None have gone to any other school.

Among the (Old) Mennonites, education is being encouraged to a greater extent every year. Goshen College is a member of the North Central Association and has over three hundred students, most of whom are (Old) Mennonites. Of course, it must be said that not all of the (Old) Mennonites are in sympathy with that educational program. Some feel that the school is too liberal and that much education is not necessary. However some of the (Old)

Mennonites go on to graduate school and receive advanced degrees. Among them are a goodly number of Ph.D.'s. The ministry, however, are as yet not required to have a certain level of education. Many have not had a high school education. However, the tendency in many congregations is to vote for the member in the congregation who has had the most training. This indicates that education for the ministers is being viewed as having greater significance.

The Central Conference churches encourage education and allow the child to go as far as his interests take him. The Conference has no college of its own, so it supports Bluffton College in Ohio and also sends students to Goshen College. The Central Conference churches are tending to require more education for their ministers. The past minister of the rural church and the present minister of the urban church both received the degree of Bachelor of Divinity from Hartford Theological Seminary. They are the only ministers of the churches selected for study that have advanced professional degrees.

For the Mennonite Brethren in Christ church, education is not restricted. The ministers, however, need not have any specific amount of education. The requirement for their ministers is that they have experienced a "call" to the ministry. The conference has encouraged the taking of a Bible course at the Fort Wayne Bible Institute, Fort Wayne, Indiana.

From the foregoing analysis it would appear that again there is a direct correlation between the acceptance of education and the degree to which accommodations have been made in the doctrines and practices of the church. The acceptance of education involves the discovery and acceptance of new ideas which will come to modify the accepted practices of the group. However, it must be said that the establishment of church colleges prevents the education from being purely secular and tends to give intellectual support to the doctrines and practices of the Mennonites. Thus, it can probably be said that the colleges both contribute to and limit the process of secularization within the Mennonite churches.

Attitude toward government.—The conservative and the moderate groups all discourage voting in any election. Fundamentally, the state uses force and hence a nonresistant cannot take part in the state. Also much of the government is corrupt (they claim) and hence they do not wish to participate in it. Then, too, they do not know the men to be voted for and they have become convinced that one party is about as bad as the other, so their vote is of no value. As a result in

all three groups, Amish, Conservative Amish, and (Old) Mennonite, fewer people vote today than in years past. None of the groups make this a "test of membership," however. The members would be subject to discipline only if they should become excited over some election and would stir up dissension in the community over politics. The liberal group, the Central Conference churches, do not discourage voting, and the majority do vote.

The same division exists with reference to the matter of holding office. All groups with the exception of the Central Conference prohibit the taking of a political office. This is considered a test of membership. The liberal churches have no restrictions against the holding of a political office, or government jobs. A member of the urban church has been a candidate for the city council.

The Mennonite Brethren in Christ church discourages the acceptance of public office. Members do vote.

All groups, with the exception of the Central Conference, have discouraged participating in the government agriculture program. This is not considered a test of membership and quite a number have participated. Among the liberal groups the matter is not discussed, for it is considered a private matter. The same holds true for the Mennonite Brethren in Christ.

Again the conclusion to be reached is that there is greater participation in governmental functions as one moves from the conservative to the liberal groups. There is a greater degree of accommodation present in the liberal groups. They have many secular interests —interests that are not subject to review by the church.

Nonresistance.—All of the Mennonite groups have held very closely to this historic principle. All in the Old Order Amish have taken C.P.S. camp service when drafted, except one or two who were not yet members. In the Conservative Amish group one went to the army (he has been banned) and one is taking noncombatant service. They have as yet taken no action on his case. He did not make a determined effort to get into a C.P.S. camp. Both rural churches among the (Old) Mennonites have 100 per cent of their inducted boys in the C.P.S. camps. The urban church had one join the army and another the Air Corps. No action will be taken against them until after the war lest it be taken as action against the government. The rural church in the Central Conference has all but one in C.P.S. One took noncombatant service. The urban Central Conference church has a poorer record. Three men joined the army and

one the navy. The pastor made an interesting observation about these boys. Three of them were inactive members of the church and consequently were not really under its influence. One boy in the Mennonite Brethren in Christ church has gone to the army, but he was converted after he registered.

Thus, with the exception of the one Conservative Amish boy, all of the boys taking military service were from urban churches. This might indicate that it is more difficult to maintain the nonresistant principle in urban areas. A part of that difficulty may derive from the fact that the urban churches tend to have a larger number of members who are "inactive." This would indicate that those inactive members have really become secularized to the point where they no longer feel at home in the church. These sacred beliefs and sanctions of the church are no longer meaningful. Secular values have been substituted.

Law observance.—All of the groups are very law observant. Very few in the various groups have ever been taken to court for crimes or misdemeanors. Aggressive lawsuits are forbidden in all of the churches and few cases of that nature have arisen. The effort is always made to arbitrate the dispute privately with the help of the minister or before the church.

The Old Order Amish have had the most difficulty with the law. Their young people have been engaged in much more rowdy behavior than the young people of the other groups. This seems to have been more true in years past than today, though it is still true. For example, about fifteen years ago a gang of Amish boys began to steal chickens, to destroy property, and to drink a bit. They were finally caught and sent to the penal farm. Only a few of the group were church members at the time. When they came back they joined the church and are now good citizens. Another gang about twenty years ago began stealing wheat. They too were caught. The judge at Lagrange told the boys that he would release them all if they would join the church. The boys all agreed to join, so they were released upon payment of a fine. "All made good," said the bishop; "they all live around here and are fine men. It was just pure devilment with them. Perhaps one reason for that existing is that we have been somewhat short on our church work for our young people." However, no discussions or plans have developed to take care of that situation. Many stories are told in the community about the Amish boys and girls, how they can be regular "hell-raisers" until they join

the church, after which they settle down and become very strict. It would almost appear that their strict life allows so many repressive tensions to arise that a fling becomes necessary for release. After the fling they can settle down and be the strictest of Amishmen. The bishop of the Conservative Amish remarked, "The Old Order Amish boys run wild for a while, but they stop when they come into the church. They go to work in the shops in town but when they get married they come back to the farm!" The minister of the rural Central Conference church said, "With our young people not one out of twenty would come back to the farm."

The conclusion here is that all of the groups, with the possible exception of a small number of Amish young people, are strict in law observance.

Property.—From the information received it is impossible to make any accurate comparison of land tenure among the various groups. Each of the ministers of the various churches estimated that from 25 to 30 per cent rented their farms. Such a figure, if correct, is considerably better than the average for all farmers in the state. Since the Amish have comparatively few expenses, no cars or modern machinery, they seem always to have money to purchase farms. The minister of the east-of-Goshen (Old) Mennonite rural church said, "The Amish buy the farms; we buy the cars." They certainly gain economic power by using the purchasing power of twentieth-century currency to maintain an eighteenth-century standard of living.

Most of the farms are well kept. One notable difference is that the Old Order Amish usually paint their barns in a drab color, or not at all. Their farms, thus, do not look quite so prosperous as the farms of the other groups.

All of the various groups make use of the banking facilities of the towns and all charge interest on money loaned or invested. However, there are frequent exceptions to the charging of interest among all of the groups. Of friends and neighbors they may not ask the payment of interest. For such loans they often ask for no note. Indeed, there are cases where non-Mennonites have not asked for notes from Amish to whom they loaned money. "Their word is better than a note" expresses this confidence.

When it comes to an examination of the type of enterprise in which investments are made, a notable difference results. The Old Order Amish tend to invest exclusively in farms, livestock, or other agricul-

tural enterprises. Among the Conservative Amish the matter is slightly different. In years past a number were caught with worthless Insul stocks and Straus Bonds. As a result they tend to invest more in their own farm enterprises or land. Of course, they have a few who invest in other enterprises. This may be partly due to the fact that more and more of their young people are going to the city to find work. Most of the farms in the community are taken up and wages are good in the city, so that is where they go.

The rural (Old) Mennonites invest almost exclusively in agricultural enterprises. Those in the urban church invest in businesses and non-farm enterprises. Most of the members are in the laboring class and consequently have not much surplus for investment. In the Central Conference churches considerably more investments are made in non-farm enterprises. This is quite largely due to the fact that they are the most urban of the various groups. Even the rural church has many members who are employed in the city, since only about a third farm. The membership of the urban Central Conference church is about ninety per cent urban. Many of its members have investments in the local milk condensery, and in other enterprises.

This analysis in summary indicates that the groups become more urban as one moves from the Old Order Amish to the Central Conference Mennonites. Consequently, the type of enterprises considered for investment is progressively in the direction of the non-agricultural, or business and industry. This raises grave questions as to whether the Mennonite principles can be maintained permanently in an urban business and industrial environment where contacts are impersonal and categoric rather than primary and sympathetic. The individualism of the city will hardly leave unaffected the Mennonite brotherhood from which is derived the social control necessary to keep the principles and practices alive.

Family.—Perhaps the first generalization, which is obvious to all, about the family life among the various Mennonite groups, is that the Old Order Amish have by far the largest families. There seems to be a direct correlation between the degree of liberalization or secularization and the size of family. The Old Order Amish are growing rapidly in spite of the fact that they have been feeding members to the Conservative Amish and (Old) Mennonite churches for years. Their communities have expanded over the years.

The Old Order Amish have a practice which is less common among the other bodies of Mennonites. When the parents grow old

the last married child remaining to take care of the farm takes possession of the large farm house and a small house near by is built for the old folks. It is called "Grandpa's little house." None of the groups have what could be called a "Grossfamilie." The children tend to leave home when they marry and "set up" farming for themselves.

Divorce or separation is very uncommon among the various Mennonite groups. The bishop of the Old Order Amish said only one out of the 140 couples he has married have divorced. That couple left the church. The Conservative Amish have no record of a divorce or separation. The same holds true for the (Old) Mennonite churches. In the rural Central Conference church one family out of sixty that the minister married experienced a divorce. The pastor of the urban Central Conference church knows of only one separation and this man married a non-Mennonite. All of the churches prohibit remarriage of a divorced person.

The obvious conclusion from this discussion is that secularization has thus far not penetrated the home or family of any of the Mennonite groups. The relation between husband and wife is considered sacred and consequently not to be lightly treated.

Mixed marriages.—From the information received in interviews with the various ministers concerning mixed marriages, no accurate figures can be given concerning its extent. Though no final conclusions can be drawn, the information received would indicate that the more liberal the group the more mixed marriages, and the more urban, the more mixed marriages occur. When the mixed marriage is between two branches of Mennonites, the more liberal group usually wins the couple. When the marriage is between a conservative Mennonite (Amish or even (Old) Mennonite) and an outside denomination, the Mennonites usually lose. Such cases are less frequent in number than intermarriages with members of other Mennonite groups.

Marriage between liberal Mennonites and non-Mennonite denominations results in about an even exchange. The minister of the Presbyterian Church of Goshen said that there really is so little difference between the urban Central Conference church and his church that the young people could feel as much at home in one as the other. And, since they meet in school and at work, it is only natural that mixed marriages occur. This results in about an even exchange. The evidence seems to show also that when a Mennonite marries a Breth-

ren, the Brethren win the couple in the majority of cases. The Brethren are so insistent about the matter of baptism by immersion that they cannot feel at home in a church that does not practice it. The west-of-Goshen rural (Old) Mennonite church has lost five out of six such couples.

It is significant that none of the Mennonite groups excommunicate their members for marriage outside the group. They attempt to bring pressure to bear upon the couple to join their church. If they choose the other church, excommunication accomplishes nothing.

This discussion would tend to indicate that the groups with the most contacts with the outside world in the realm of business, education, and participation in secular organizations have the most cases of mixed marriage. Such cases are least disturbing to them because it is not so difficult for non-Mennonites to join their church and subscribe to its "accepted" doctrines and practices. The conclusion, however, cannot be drawn that the extent of mixed marriage in any of the groups is phenomenal or a significant indication of movement to other Mennonite or non-Mennonite groups. The number of such cases is not large enough to be disturbing or disruptive in any of the groups. This would cause one to conclude that Mennonite conscientiousness and solidarity have held all, including the liberal groups, together. Even the liberal groups will point out cases where marriage with a non-Mennonite has ended unfortunately, the implication being that such would not have occurred had both parties been Mennonite.

Conclusions

In conclusion, it can be said that the study at Goshen substantiated the hypotheses put forth and summarized at the beginning of this discussion. The materials at Goshen show quite conclusively that divisions among the Mennonites have constructed a ladder of liberalism which makes possible the movement of the more liberal individuals from the conservative to the liberal groups.

In general, the liberalized Mennonite does join a more liberal Mennonite group if such a group is conveniently located. In Goshen there are very few Mennonites in non-Mennonite churches. The Methodist Church has by far the most—about 25 or 30 of their more than 600 members are of Mennonite background. The Presbyterian, Reformed, Congregational, and Lutheran Churches have no more than half a dozen each. These joined, in most instances, years ago when there was no Mennonite church in the city and it was too far

to drive to the country churches. Since the establishment of the liberal Central Conference church in Goshen, that movement has ceased. The other factor involved in this joining of churches outside the Mennonite was mixed marriage. There seemed to be none that joined these non-Mennonite churches because of rebellion against the doctrines and practices. Each minister testified that the former Mennonites in their congregation make excellent members and they find, as the pastor of the Congregational Church put it, "They hold very closely to their sacred outlook on life and remain devoted to Mennonite principles."

Liberalization does seem to take place more extensively on the fringe of the Mennonite community or in a community that is less isolated, i.e., not a large, compactly settled community. The Old Order Amish around Nappanee, Indiana, a smaller colony, are experiencing much more disorganization than is present in the large community east of Goshen. Several individuals who have left the Mennonite church made use of this phrase: "Of course, we lived on the edge of the Mennonites." However, it is quite possible that this principle is not quite as significant as in former years. The radio, newspaper, and magazines tend to penetrate deep into the area (particularly the radio and to a lesser degree the newspaper and the magazine) and form the associations with the outside world that formerly occurred at the fringe of the settlement.

Only a few cases were discovered when the movement was in the direction of the more conservative. Where a Conservative Amish joined the Old Order Amish, or a Central Conference Mennonite joined the (Old) Mennonite church it was usually due to a mixed marriage. All other movement was in the direction of the more liberal.

It would, therefore, seem that the propositions presented at the outset of this discussion have been validated. However, much more investigation should be undertaken.

The question whether this movement toward secularization is beneficial or detrimental shall be left unanswered. It is quite possible that thus far the process has been more beneficial than detrimental. If that is the case, the question arises, how can the process of secularization be halted before its destructive aspects begin to appear?

THE SOCIOLOGICAL AND ECONOMIC SIGNIFICANCE OF THE MENNONITES AS A CULTURE GROUP IN HISTORY*

ERNST CORRELL

The literature on Anabaptist and Mennonite history accumulated through the centuries is full of contrasting modes of interpretation. Obviously such variety is explained neither by the nationality of authors nor even by distinguishing Mennonite from non-Mennonite writers. Cutting across these obvious divisions runs a medley of themes trying to interpret Anabaptist-Mennonite groups so as to make them fit all sorts of purposes. Established concepts of church history present one set of explanatory patterns. Others are introduced to prove more or less fanciful theories intended to resolve Mennonite historical data into some facile *rationale*. By these particular methods of psychological and sociological characterization certain phases of human history and experience are to be given an "intelligent" (if not "intellectual") meaning.

When I received the proposed program of the "Conference on Mennonite Sociology" and with it the privilege of an invitation to deal with "the sociological and economic significance of the Mennonites as a cultural group in history," I hope I was correct in assuming that you did not expect me to contribute nor to rephrase one of those theorems. I felt rather that you wished me to present you with *plain* views on Mennonite history and Mennonite attainments, as such *plain* views have accrued to me on the horizon of two decades of study in both the European and the American field.

To be sure, I entered originally into Anabaptist and Mennonite research under the guidance of a historical sociologist, or rather economic historian, the late Max Weber of the University of Munich. Fortunately, however, we were not expected to fit socio-economic phenomena into a framework of interpretive prejudices. It has been my fortune to develop the first comprehensive study of the economic behavior of Mennonites. Because of the overwhelming sum total of outstanding data discovered, the treatment had to be restricted to the Swiss agricultural type. Subsequent opportunities

* A paper read at the Conference on Mennonite Sociology, Chicago, Illinois, December 31, 1941.

in the search for sources in European and American public and private archives, the identification and evaluation of masses of documents of all kinds, kept me close to root questions concerning the entire Anabaptist-Mennonite movement, past and present. So impressive has been my own personal experience in the exploration and study of the large and practically unfurrowed fields that I could not simply dispose of the problems within the confines of the social sciences. At the risk of what may be called an "unscientific attitude," I am prepared to state that the glorious religious history of the Anabaptist-Mennonite people everywhere, that their ethical conflicts, historic as well as current, have made me much more conscious of their position and their vital concerns than any signal Mennonite contribution to the economic and technological history of the world at large.

I find no more practical way to discuss "the sociological and economic significance of the Mennonites as a cultural group in history" than to resolve the theme into this observation: *as a cultural group in history, the economic significance of the Mennonites is a distinct by-product of their religio-sociological existence.* In elaborating this restatement in the light of the urgent agenda of your conference on current issues, it is possible only to sketch some of the important points.

No itemization of achievements can illustrate properly the social and economic history of the Mennonites, nor can a chronological summary of events assembled from here and there.

There are, it seems to me, certain prerequisites fundamental to the understanding of practically any aspect of the Anabaptist-Mennonite tradition. First of all, there is needed an appreciation of the fact that our forebears of the early sixteenth century associated in *voluntary* groups. Inspired by the propulsive force of Biblical ideas, they saw no higher goal than to live in accord with the teachings of the Sermon on the Mount. As we examine the martyr-records of Anabaptist history (martyr-records reaching forward into the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries and beyond) we discover among them generations upon generations of *"responsible personalities."* Under the Fatherhood of God and in keeping with the brotherhood of man these "responsible personalities" braced themselves against conditions of spiritual as well as politico-economic distress. They declared their "conscientious objection" to a variety of forces levelled against the patriarchal family or kinship group. It was on this

natural basis of corporate life and within an atmosphere of deepening conflicts for the inner and outer man, that the concept and institution of the *"beloved communities"* were formed—that central structure of the Anabaptist-Mennonite mode of life. Families were banded together in socio-religious groupings. Aloof from semi-political church establishments and the governmental systems of their day the pattern of their manifest destiny followed Biblical examples and warnings. Naturally the Anabaptists continued also certain elements of their immediate environment. A fraternal tradition of the sib and a uniform guidance conducted by both the family and the authority exercised by a *free* group church created unique socio-religious communities. These Anabaptist-Mennonite brotherhoods constitute the most radical outcome of the Protestant Reformation. Courageously they faced the ridicule and disgust of the ruling society of their own milieu and the onslaught of juridical powers.

While persecution descended frightfully upon them because of determined nonconformity to military-political commands and to inroads of acquisitive practices on a prevailing natural subsistence economy, the Brethren brought forth a galaxy of able leaders. Such leadership arose through the full implications of a democratic polity and theory of religious government in contrast to, and in conflict with, the hierarchies of the established and "establishing" churches, Catholic and Reformed. It will always be a matter of intuition for the student of Anabaptism to assess the import of that responsible personality type of man which lends itself to successful leadership under most trying conditions. Under all circumstances of dispersion, refugee distress, migration, land-seeking, temporary or final settlement the world over—it was the *religious leader* who directed as well as conditioned those technological attainments which have claimed the notice of posterity.

The type of man who assumed authority in Anabaptist-Mennonite circles has fascinated me as an example of the broadest application of that famous "general priesthood" idea of the Reformation. Its functional effect on the shaping and maintaining of a sound socio-economic order seems to be unrivaled by any other similar situation. This is especially noticeable when one realizes the prolonged persecution, threats, and belittlement directed against outstanding leaders.

Those Christians who put themselves under the divine sanction of the Sermon on the Mount created and cultivated a mind and attitude

that was "a-political," non-military. They did that in the midst of much adversity and under circumstances which would encourage direct, violent action. By their claim of a "higher law," they introduced into a turbulent environment a "nonresistant," "defenseless" type of man. A new spirit and interpretation of human relations, informed with ethical earnestness and purpose, came to life among these new believers while around them peasant leagues petitioned loudly for the redress of their sore grievances and peasant armies marched to bloody though futile battles. We should remember that the "conscientious objector" principle carried a broader significance in the early period than it does today. It had then a more immediate bearing on practical interests. Now that position is related essentially to a benevolent democratic government which respects genuine adherence to this principle by providing legislative adjustments. For a true understanding of the difference, one must go back to the testimony of Conrad Grebel; to Menno Simons' *Fundamentboek* of 1539; to Pilgram Marpeck's *Verwahrung und Verantwortung* of the 1540's; to Tieleman Jansz van Bragh't's Dutch *Bloedig Tooneel of Martelaarspiegel* of 1660; to the Swiss *Ausbund* hymnal of 1564 and its later editions. Only by such immediate documentations of original life-evidence is one in a position to conceive of the kind of men and women who formed, in "separation from the world," those "defenseless," "nonresistant" communities of natural kinship and religious accord. Comparison within a large non-Mennonite atmosphere shows how a resolute stand of "defenselessness" in the face of many conflicts evolved a new feeling for stewardship; a desire for self-discipline; a refining of sense—elements that climaxed in the making of the "responsible personality type of man," the motivating force in "Mennonite Sociology."

A realistic appraisal of Mennonite traditions in faith and practice must take into account the fact that they grew and bore fruit mainly in an environment of rural life and town handicraft economy. Only certain portions of the Dutch Doopsgezinde groups and of the North German movement were more closely and more generally tied to a relatively advanced merchant civilization. Historically, an agricultural occupation predominated; and among genuine Mennonite groups, it still does. Records of more emphatically *urban* Mennonite communities as well as of any fringe of Mennonite life that fell under the spell of progressive urbanization, however, bear shocking witness to gradual decline, if not complete extinction. We find Mennonite groups involved in the rise of Western European

industrial and commercial capitalism; and faithfully adding to the economic foundation of the absolute states. Under such auspices we see them attain some very high points in the development of textile industries, in commercial navigation, shipping and trade activities. But if your agenda need any particular suggestions for research projects in Mennonite history and sociology, here is one of difficult proportions: the changing spirit and the decline of Western European urbanized Mennonites.

However, we need not leave the confines of the American hemisphere. Some of the problems mentioned are indicated with us in a perhaps less direct but nevertheless potentially threatening fashion. Safe from those cataclysmic political disturbances which struck Europe through the centuries, American Mennonite communities of Swiss, German and Dutch origin were thus better able to take care of their cultural heritage. Nevertheless, the gigantic industrial-commercial growth of the United States, the extension of metropolitan economies, the accelerated spread of urban habits, could not fail to engulf the American Mennonite people. In many respects their external conditions run the gamut of cycles and of risks at the mercy of domineering business. The economic map of North and South America shows Mennonite settlements embedded in a variety of conditional circumstances. Among them we notice in Latin-American countries the daring pioneer efforts of recent European Mennonite refugees. As such developments are due to the emergency support brought by wholehearted fraternal assistance, there is at once indicated the ancient religious Mennonite bond—that dynamic inward power which in all epochs has characterized Mennonite history and kept it alive. As we point to this one great event one recognizes the many decisive chapters in the chronology of American agriculture which Mennonite immigrant-pioneers helped to write. Through these vanguard achievements shines the *voluntary* principle of the *"beloved community"* by which Mennonite personalities and Mennonite sociological techniques helped to overcome hazards of frontier precariousness and fluctuating pressures of an intenser market economy.

The uniqueness and relative economic strength of American Mennonite agriculture is, of course, also a direct response to natural factors of soil and climate. Some of the outstanding agricultural achievements made by the Mennonites in the United States and Canada were in no little measure sustained also in relation to governmental and railroad colonial promotions, especially in incipient pio-

neering times. More recently, the Dominion and provincial departments of agriculture in Canada and those of the Federal and State governments in the United States have directed special public attention to the uniqueness of Mennonite achievements. This singling out of model attainments for the sake of a needed recovery of agricultural affairs in general may well encourage such efforts as those of your conference. There is perhaps no more stirring observation in this respect than the one made by Dr. Oliver E. Baker of the U. S. Department of Agriculture in his essay on "The Farmer and National Unity," which is just off the University of Chicago Press in a collection entitled *Democracy and National Unity,* edited by W. T. Hutchinson. Stressing "rural familistic philosophy" for the protection of the future of the American farm population, Dr. Baker points to the Mennonites as a supreme example. Meanwhile, the Division of Farm Population and Rural Welfare of the Department of Agriculture continues its great project of field studies under the direction of such eminent specialists as Carl C. Taylor, Charles P. Loomis, and John Provinse. Dr. Walter Kollmorgen's assignment to Pennsylvania led to a most fruitful analysis of the factors responsible for agricultural stability in the heart of Mennonite Lancaster County.

As such "outsiders"—though equipped with a public conscience—explore and analyze the Mennonite agricultural tradition and make their telling discoveries on the efficacy of its socio-religious pattern—a conference such as yours, I am sure, will not fail to provide sufficient ingenuity and the needed sympathetic subtlety to solve some of the more complex problems. Even "outsiders" are convinced that no super-scientific "ecology" will ever solve some of these issues. May God bless you in your endeavors to safeguard a high and saintly heritage!

[Editorial Note: In view of the restricted accessibility of Professor Correll's original work, *Das Schweizerische Täufer-Mennonitentum,* Tubingen 1925, reference is made to some of the outstanding reviews by:
1. The late historian and sociologist Prof. H. H. Maurer in *The American Journal of Sociology* (1926)
2. Dr. H. S. Bender in *The American Historical Review* (1926)
3. Dr. Th. Greyerz in *Zeitschrift für Schweizerische Geschichte* (1926)
4. Prof. Walther Koehler (Prof. of Church History) in *Theologische Literaturzeitung* (1926) and in *Deutsche Literaturzeitung* (1927)
5. Dr. Otto Schilling (Prof. of Catholic Moral Theology) in *Theologische Revue* (1928)
6. The late Dr. Alfons Paquet, German Quaker leader, in the *Literaturblatt der Frankfurter Zeitung* (January 9, 1927)].

RURAL LIFE PROBLEMS AND THE MENNONITES*

MELVIN GINGERICH

Students of American economic history are well acquainted with the forces that brought about "the humbling of the farmer." The histories of recent America have their chapters on the "farm problem," in which the economic difficulties confronting the farmer since the World War are clearly described. But in many of these accounts, forces that are not purely economic have not received adequate treatment. The subject of this paper is not "farm problems and the Mennonites" but "rural life problems and the Mennonites," a wording that suggests the program committee wished a treatment much broader than an economic one.

Indeed, what has happened to American rural life during the years of this century has far-reaching cultural and spiritual implications. The relationship between these factors is shown by M. L. Wilson, from the United States Department of Agriculture, when he writes,

> Scientific agriculture, and specialization through commercialization, have vastly increased the farmer's productiveness. One hundred and fifty years ago, it took nineteen farmers to produce sufficient surplus food for one city person. Today, nineteen farmers can produce enough surplus food for sixty-six non-farm people. This much is gain. But he has had to incur a vast increase in debts to supply himself with sufficient equipment to do this. And in tying his economic destinies to the market, he has placed his personal and family happiness at the mercy of whatever panics or depressions may come. He can no longer dig in during hard times, live simply off the products of his farm, and merely wait for better times. He has interest and amortization payments to make. He has fuel to buy before he can turn a furrow. And since he has become a specialized, scientific producer of but one or two or three commercial items, he must buy and pay cash for goods and services that were once supplied right on the farm, or else were unheard of and unwanted. The decline of farmer's equity in farm real estate from 59 per cent in 1890 to 39 per cent in 1935; the rise in farm indebtedness from about 3½ billion dollars in 1910 to just under 8 billions in 1935 casts an ominous shadow. The old security of the land is vastly lessened, if not altogether gone. There is room to wonder, with the chorus of Archibald MacLeish's *Land of the Free,* "We wonder if the liberty was land."
>
> Furthermore, while the undesirable features of a former isolation have disappeared because of railroads, automobiles, hard roads, telephones, con-

*A paper read at the Conference on Mennonite Sociology, Chicago, Illinois, December 31, 1941.

solidated schools, movies, chain stores, mail order houses, rural free delivery, and so on, the cultural alteration may not be wholly for the good. With the old isolation ended, spectator amusements have in many cases replaced participant amusements. Standardized mass radio and movie entertainments have in a measure taken the place of recreational activities in which the fun was in doing, not just watching or listening. It's all to the good, I believe, if the farmer can now enjoy the urban advantages of good books, better schools, and great music. But I doubt that real social values are gained by substituting Hollywood thrillers and syndicated comic strips for the social life and the Sunday-school lessons of the old-fashioned rural church.[1]

The economic forces to which Wilson refers have had their influence upon our Mennonite rural communities as well as upon other groups. Many Mennonite farmers have lost their farms after years of hard labor upon them. They have been reduced to the status of renters, paying their yearly rents to insurance and loan companies for the privilege of remaining upon the land they have developed. How tragic this experience has been only those who have been the victims of these forces or have watched their neighbors go through these trying times can fully appreciate. When pride of ownership and the sense of security so necessary for the development of stable community life are disappearing, the foundations of our formerly successful community life are in jeopardy. Mennonite young people observing these trends have hoped they might obtain economic security in the cities. The loss of potential leadership produced by migration of our young people to the city can not be measured. From the Iowa community in which the writer was raised have gone out in the last fifteen years at least six Ph.D.'s. Who can say how much this community may have lost in this migration!

Another paper will treat the subject of the secularization of the Mennonites. Permit me to make a brief statement on this subject, however, by pointing out that as rural isolation disappeared the culture pattern of our Mennonite communities lost much of its distinctiveness and came to be fashioned by our local high schools, 4-H Clubs, Farm Bureaus, radio programs, daily papers, and much as we dislike to admit it, by the movies. Mennonites became more and more interested in proving to others that they were really not so "queer" after all and that in the main they differed little from the society around them. Many of them were slow to confess that they were Mennonites and disclaimed any spiritual kinship to the Amish

1. Baker, O. E.; Borsodi, R.; Wilson, M. L. *Agriculture in Modern Life*. 1939. Harper.

or Hutterites for fear that they would be considered to be "queer." In other words, Mennonite culture was weakened as the nationwide trend towards standardization broke down our barriers of isolation.

This is not to suggest that change is undesirable and that we have gained nothing. The mechanization of our farms has released us from much drudgery and has given us leisure time which our forefathers could not enjoy. The modernizing of our educational system and of our religious program has been a desirable innovation. But the question must be raised as to whether we have not allowed undesirable changes to be forced upon us also through the pressure exerted by these powerful forces.

Our former rural security is disappearing, we are becoming secularized, our community life is breaking down, and our culture is losing its distinctive qualities. What can be done about it? The fatalists say the farmer is doomed, that he cannot control or direct those worldwide forces coming out of the industrial and agricultural revolutions. They admit that Mennonite and Amish farmers in eastern Pennsylvania have been able to maintain a fairly successful rural community life, but they doubt if this can be duplicated anywhere else in America. Some even suggest that we take it for granted that America will eventually become completely industrialized and that the few remaining farmers will be reduced to serfdom.

There are others, however, who, like Thomas Jefferson, fear the stratification of our society into the two classes of capitalists and wage earners. They are convinced that the roots of democracy are in the soil and that a free society can no longer exist when land ownership is no longer widely distributed. One needs only read from men like Ligutti, Baker, Borsodi, Wilson, Sanderson, Morgan, and others, to become thoroughly convinced that the preservation of rural community life is essential to the welfare of our society.

O. E. Baker, senior agricultural economist of the United States Department of Agriculture, shows, for example, that a prosperous rural life is essential for the preservation of the American population. City populations do not reproduce themselves but grow only through migrations from rural areas and foreign countries. He writes, "I postulate as a basic principle of national policy the reproduction of the race, for if the nation is transitory all objectives take on the flavor of futility." In addition he states, "The modern urban philosophy of life, apparently, tends towards extinction; the rural philosophy of life towards survival. The urban philosophy of life

is ephemeral; the rural philosophy of life is derived, apparently, from the experience of the race accumulated through the ages. But it is obvious that if the rural people accept the urban philosophy of life, the rural people also will die out, and the hope of building a permanent civilization will perish. A great problem is how to hold science and democracy, which have brought so much wealth and liberty and happiness into the world, yet avoid the biological consequences of the immensely widened opportunity to climb the economic and social ladder, for to probably a majority of the climbers, owing to conditions which have developed in the cities, children are an encumbrance. I expect this problem will be solved primarily by the rural people and through a return to a more familistic civilization."[2]

In other words, if the race is not to die out, the type of rural family life in which children are not a liability must be encouraged. But there is a second reason for the preservation of a prosperous rural community life. It has been suggested above that the roots of democracy are in the soil. It is not the contention of this paper that democracy is the *Christian* form of government. Enduring spiritual values have been fostered and preserved in political systems not democratic. It is the contention of this paper, however, that the greatest spiritual and social progress can be made in those societies which stand for freedom of thought and religion. Democratic governments at the present time grant greater freedom to the human spirit than do their opposites. We who are interested in the preservation of spiritual values, therefore, look with favor upon those forces that help strengthen democracy.

The man who is an economic slave can not think fearlessly. He becomes the victim of a mode of thought not conducive to liberty. The proletariat, or wage earner, as Ligutti points out, forgets what it is to be free and in his dissatisfaction turns from one despot to another. He feels no incentive to save, for the ownership of property seems only a remote possibility and he has never experienced its liberating influences. He has no roots, he has nothing worth defending, he drifts from place to place, he regards work as an evil thing, a burden wrongfully imposed by another, and his ideal becomes to get as much as possible for as little as possible. This in substance is Ligutti's indictment.[3] Give the wage earner a garden, a home, a

2. *Ibid.*

3. Ligutti, L. G. and Rawe, J. C., *Rural Roads to Security.* 1940. Bruce Pub. Co.

small farm and you transform him, says Ligutti. Now he has a reason to save, he has a stake in the preservation of society, he has enough economic independence to assert his own mind and he looks with suspicion upon the radicals who would turn society upside down.

Arthur E. Morgan, formerly of the TVA, tells us that the qualities of character necessary for the preservation of our society are stifled in our large cities. In the city one learns to look upon others primarily as competitors, and there is little opportunity to develop a spirit of neighborliness with those living near you. Society, says Morgan, in the final analysis, exists and functions not because of force and law imposed from above but because people in primary groups, that is, small groups in villages and rural communities, have learned to trust each other and to work in harmonious co-operation. Sympathy, human understanding, good-will, neighborliness—these are the qualities of character necessary for the functioning of society and these can be stimulated only in community life. Any force that tends to break down community life is a menace; any influence that encourages community life is highly desirable. Thus speaks the former chairman of the TVA.[4]

The Mennonites have generally been farmers. In those places where they have preserved a distinctive Christian testimony for generations, they have been people of a rural philosophy. As Dr. Ernst Correll has so ably shown, for many generations they have been famous as successful farmers. Their rural community life has been in the main a very successful one. With this background, does it not follow that the Mennonites should try very definitely to preserve their way of life, a way that according to the views of our leading rural sociologists can help save our society and civilization from destruction?

What can be done about it? In the first place, our people must be made community conscious. They must be encouraged to study the history of their faith and the history of their own communities. A number of papers in the 1941 meeting of the American Historical Association were devoted to the value of local history as a means of bringing about an interest in the community and its problems. As people become interested in the history of their local community, they will come to have a deep respect for it and to feel that it is worth

4. Morgan, O. E. "Not the Farm, Not the City—But the Small Community," *Des Moines Register*, August 26, 1941.

sacrificing for and preserving. We must encourage the study of Mennonite church history and local community history.

In the second place, we must acquaint our people with what the sociologists are saying about the importance of preserving community life. This can be done by series of articles in our church papers, by having rural life conferences, and by offering more courses and perhaps even short terms in our Mennonite colleges on the problems of rural life. Bishop S. F. Coffman of Vineland, Ontario, has long urged the launching of a Mennonite rural life paper. Such a magazine would not primarily concern itself with how to earn and save money but with farming as a culturally and spiritually satisfying way of life. This paper could well be a joint product of the different bodies of Mennonites. Our college classes in rural sociology should be set to the task of preparing a prospectus for *The Mennonite Farmer*.[5]

In the third place, our people should be led to see that it is no sin to be different. Their attention should be called to those communities that have dared to preserve their folkways. The Dutch community at Pella, Iowa, with its annual tulip festival and its museum of historical treasures, is only one illustration of many that could be given. Many of our scholars are emphasizing the importance of regionalism in American cultural life, believing that American culture can be kept infinitely richer by preserving local folkways and customs rather than by encouraging all communities to fall into the pattern of a standardized American life.[6]

Fourth, we must not only make our people community conscious and give them a sense of mission for the preservation of the values of rural community life but we must somehow make rural life economically desirable. We must make it possible for our young men to borrow money cheaply in order to purchase farms and farm equipment. Mennonite capitalists as stewards of the Lord's money must be made to see their opportunities of helping our young people. Per-

---

5. Since the above was written, the writer devoted one of his weekly columns in *The Mennonite Weekly Review*, Newton, Kansas, to a discussion of the need of a Mennonite rural life paper. There was an enthusiastic response to the suggestion, and as a result, a number of faculty members from Tabor and Bethel colleges have been working on a plan for a publication to be submitted to the Mennonite Rural Life Conference in August, 1942.

6. There have been many expressions of interest in Mennonite culture. A recent letter from W. M. Kollmorgen, United States Department of Agriculture, states, "My good wishes are with you in your effort to preserve the culture of Mennonitism. I know of no people who have a finer tradition of rural life and good farming."

haps they could be encouraged to invest their capital in small village factories where our people might increase their cash income by part-time employment.

It appears to the writer that one of the most fruitful ways of stimulating interest in and loyalty to our Mennonite communities would be to make them models of forest and soil conservation. We with our background of saving, simple living, and frugal farming, with our emphasis upon the preservation of goods as opposed to the destruction of warfare should set the national standards in the conservation movement. We can look forward with confidence to the time when the young men trained in our civilian public service camps will transform farming methods in many of our communities.

In the next place, there must be new explorations in the possibilities of the simple life. As we receive increasing satisfactions from our devotion to the ideals of a new, better, more co-operative community life, we will learn to depend less upon *things* for our pleasures. We should learn from men like Borsodi that it is possible to produce on the farm many of the articles and services we now purchase. As we buy fewer things, our economic life will become more secure than it has been. Furthermore, as children are trained to help in the production of a variety of goods they cease to be economic liabilities and the familistic type of life is encouraged.

But perhaps before many of these objectives can be reached, an attempt should be made to bring this vision to all the members of our college faculties. In our faculty meetings there should be studies of and book reports on rural life problems. Men like O. E. Baker should be brought to our campuses for series of lectures. We must have faculties who have caught the vision of the new frontiers in co-operative community living and who will not educate our young people away from a type of life for which they are fitted and which needs to be encouraged if a desirable form of society is to continue.

MENNONITE COMMUNITY LIFE IN RUSSIA

CORNELIUS KRAHN

Mennonite Communities in Russia and America

When we compare the Mennonite communities of Russia with some of those in Kansas, Nebraska, Minnesota, the Dakotas, Manitoba, and Saskatchewan, we find a number of similarities which are due to the fact that the latter have been transplanted from Russia. And yet many features of the former community life have been given up in adjustment to modern American needs. With the exception of the settlements in Manitoba and Saskatchewan we no longer find the typical Mennonite village community, such as was founded in the pioneer days in the vicinity of Hillsboro, Kansas (*Gnadenau*). Perfectly straight was the main and only street, bordered on each side by a fence and a row of poplars. In front of each house was an orchard and flower garden and behind the house a vegetable garden. Dutch cleanliness pervaded both house and yard.

The Mennonites of Russia lived not on scattered homesteads but in village communities, which usually consisted of from ten to forty homesteads. All buildings were of the same style. Dwelling, horse and cow barn, and sheds were under the same roof. The materials used were either brick, logs, or adobe. The Mennonites had brought the style of architecture of these buildings, as well as their entire layout of the village community, from their Prussian homes in the Vistula delta around Danzig, whence they had migrated to Russia.

In the center of the village one would find the schoolhouse and other public buildings. On the outskirts of the village was a small hut for the herdsman, usually the only Russian in the community. Early in the morning he would go down the street rounding up the cattle to drive them to the community pasture, returning them to their respective owners each evening.

An average Mennonite settlement usually consisted of some ten to fifty villages. The oldest settlement is Chortitza (1789) and the largest Molotschna (1800), both of which are located in the

---

* A paper read at the Conference on Mennonite Sociology, Chicago, Illinois, December 31, 1941.

Ukraine. These are the two main, or the so-called mother colonies, from which most of the new settlements or daughter-colonies originated.

The civil authority of each village community was the "Schulz," and of the entire settlement, the "Oberschulz." Up to the seventies of the past century all Mennonite settlements were responsible to a special Russian Governmental Committee (Fürsorge-Kommittee) in Odessa. Later they became directly responsible to their respective Russian local authorities.

Some Economic, Social, Cultural, and Religious Aspects of Mennonite Community Life

The first Mennonite settlers in the Ukraine were the poorest element of the Prussian Mennonites. Small scale silk-producing and cattle-raising were practiced during the first decades. With the improvement of transportation facilities and markets, however, the Mennonites gradually changed over to wheat-raising. Thus the Mennonite wheat farmer, well known both in the plains of Russia and America, was born. Before the World War farming was the occupation of the Mennonites of Russia. The following quotations may indicate how closely wheat farming and Mennonitism were interwoven. A well-known minister and professor of the Mennonites of Russia exclaimed: "No occupation is more honorable than farming." But he also lamented: "Durch den Weizenhaufen gingen unsere Gedanken zu Gott."

Before the World War the Mennonites had also developed their own industries, specializing in milling and the manufacture of agricultural machinery. At that time ten per cent of all agricultural machinery in the Ukraine was made in Mennonite factories.

During the middle of the past century some problems arose in Mennonite community life. Mennonites had large families. They doubled in number within twenty-five years. The farms given to the original settlers could not be divided. Through these conditions the so-called "landless" problem arose. Approximately two thirds of the Mennonite population was without land, living in poor huts as so-called "Anwohner," and eking out a meager living from what work they could get. But finally as a result of concerted pressure on the part of those who were underprivileged, the mother colonies gradually adopted plans to buy land and finance new settlements. The fact that Mennonite settlements were found almost all over

Russia, west of the Dnieper and South of Moscow, is to a large extent due to this awakened and fostered sense of solidarity and mutual responsibility.

Let us turn to another page of the history of Mennonitism in Russia—its cultural and religious development, which we shall briefly summarize. We should bear in mind that the Mennonite emigrants from Prussia to the Ukraine had left their Prussian homes partly because Mennonitism in that country had undergone a radical change through being exposed to the eastward penetrating German-Prussian civilization which threatened to undermine the unified and isolated existence of historic Mennonitism. And now, being heterogeneous to the Russian environment as to language, nationality, social status, civilization, and religion, the Mennonites had to draw their spiritual and cultural nourishment from sources related to them in order to prevent religious formalism and stagnation and cultural decline. In this isolation, remote from resources homogeneous to Mennonite community life, and living in an environment distinct from it, Mennonitism experienced a crucial period around the middle of the past century. It lost a part of its spiritual and cultural savor, due to the before-mentioned economic crisis. Church divisions occurring during this time were both evidence of, and protests against, the described conditions.

Being a "state within a state," the Mennonites confronted all problems common to any autonomous group in a large national state. Laws had to be made and enforced. How could this be harmonized with the strict principle of nonresistance and the refusal to hold public offices? Because of this "inconsistency," a group, which became the "Kleine Gemeinde," separated itself from the main body of Mennonites.

Besides the above-described sources of spiritual and cultural life there were other related environmental influences within the reach of some Mennonite settlements. The pietistic preaching of a neighboring German-Lutheran minister, Edward Wüst, resulted in a spiritual revival among the Mennonites and finally culminated in the founding of the Mennonite Brethren church.

But the advancement of Mennonite community life did not depend solely on outside influences and sources. It produced some great leaders of its own—men who were pioneers in the fields of agriculture, industry, education, and religion. Among them we should mention first of all Johann Cornies as a leader in the field of education

and agriculture, and Bernhard Harder as a spiritual leader and writer.

The Mennonites had developed a well organized educational system, which greatly influenced early educational attempts of the Mennonites in the Middle West. Also the different branches of the mutual aid system and the organized care for the aged and the sick were established in Russia and found their continuation in America, where they still exist. The present Civilian Public Service camps, in which Mennonites fulfil their duty toward their country, had their predecessors in the Forestry Service of the Mennonites in Russia. Thus we could continue to describe Mennonite community life and its influence on Mennonite life in America.

Russian Mennonites or Mennonites of Russia?

We have described Mennonitism in Russia as a religious and cultural unit living in Russia but rooting in a Mennonite-interpreted German-Prussian civilization. Therefore, it would be confusing to use the term *Russian* Mennonites. A Russian census of 1897 showed that only seven tenths of one per cent of the Mennonites considered Russian as their mother tongue.

But at the present time a Russianization process is in progress stronger than ever before. In closing let us enumerate some of the factors which are responsible for these conditions. First of all, in the seventies, Russian became the official language for intercourse between the settlements and the government and was introduced into the schools. Secondly, increased higher education before the World War brought the Mennonites into closer contact with the Russian civilization. Furthermore, the World War itself threatened and endangered Mennonite community life. And finally, the most tragic phase in all Mennonite history since the time which is recorded on the pages of the *Martyrs' Mirror,* resulted when the Russian Revolution broke out. A systematic breaking up and collectivization of the Mennonite settlements almost entirely annihilated all phases of Mennonite community life.*

*For further information see A. Ehrt, *Das Mennonitentum in Russland von seiner Einwanderung bis in die Gegenwart*, Langensalza, Germany, 1932 (a sociological and enonomic survey); D. G. Rempel's thesis on the Mennonites in Russia up to the World War (English, but still in manuscript, in GCL), and the other well-known sources.

A HISTORY OF WINTER BIBLE SCHOOLS IN THE MENNONITE CHURCH

CLARENCE FRETZ

(*Concluded from April, 1942, issue*)

VIII

THE "MIGRATORY" CONFERENCE WINTER BIBLE SCHOOLS

As previously noted, the first winter Bible school to be sponsored by a conference was established in the Ontario Mennonite Conference district in 1907 to provide Bible instruction for the constituency of that conference. Inasmuch as this conference district, like the typical Mennonite conference district, was a fairly compact settlement of Mennonites, a permanent central location for the school proved quite satisfactory. But when winter Bible schools were established in conference districts where the constituency was more scattered, the conference Bible school with its faculty held its sessions at various places in the conference district, either from year to year or within the same year. It will be the purpose of this chapter to trace the rise and development of the four "migratory" conference winter Bible schools in the Mennonite Church.

These schools because of the difficulties encountered were held somewhat irregularly, at least at first. However, a fairly complete history can be constructed from the information sent in on questionnaires by the present secretaries of these schools. Data on one of them was gathered from a history of the conference district. However, a number of gaps in these histories were found, because inadequate records had been kept. A brief history will be given of each of the following four schools: Dakota-Montana Winter Bible School, Pacific Coast Winter Bible School, Ontario A. M.[50] Bible School, and the Winter Bible School of the Alberta-Saskatchewan Mennonite Conference District.

Dakota-Montana Winter Bible School. The founder of this school was J. C. Gingerich, then pastor of the congregation at Wolford, North Dakota. The matter of a school was taken up with the

50. Amish-Mennonite, loosely affiliated with the Mennonite General Conference.

ministerial body of the Dakota-Montana Conference, and Conference decided to appoint a Winter Bible School Committee to take charge of the work. This committee, composed of three members, one elected each year, has been in charge ever since, selecting teachers and helping to arrange the course of study.

The first session was held at Wolford, North Dakota, for four weeks, beginning January 12, 1920. Simon Gingerich of Wayland, Iowa, was secured to teach and to serve as principal, with J. C. Gingerich as his assistant. They drew up the first course of study. J. C. Gingerich states that the purpose for which the school was established was to "supply better and more definite Bible knowledge, and indoctrinate the rising generation."[51]

Few definite facts about the early history of the school could be secured. The school was held irregularly, averaging an attendance of about twenty-five per year, in the various congregations of the conference district located at the following places: Wolford, Minot, and Kenmare, North Dakota; Bloomfield, Montana; and Detroit Lakes, Minnesota. The school was moved from one congregation to another to reach more of the scattered membership which totaled less than four hundred. The course of study varied, and included such subjects as Doctrines, Music, Missions, Book Study, Pauline Epistles, Old Testament History, and the Mennonite Elementary Teacher Training courses. The length of term varied from two to four weeks, making difficult any standardization of courses. In recent years the school has been financed by offerings in the congregations (formerly students were charged tuition) to pay instructors' expenses. No charges are made except for textbooks. The school has been held annually since 1931-32, in from one to three congregations each year.

Pacific Coast Winter Bible School. S. G. Shetler, in his *Church History of the Pacific Coast Mennonite Conference District,* gives a good account of the origin and early history of this school. Shetler was the first principal and a leader in getting the school started.

A need was felt for the school for some time before it was finally launched. In 1917 the Pacific Coast Conference appointed a School Committee to attempt to establish a church school on the coast. In 1919 the Committee reported that nothing definite had been done, but that a six-week Bible Normal was being considered. But it was

51. J. C. Gingerich, in questionnaire, 1938.

not until 1920 that steps were taken to arrange for a six-week Bible school. In that year, the Conference appointed S. G. Shetler as an additional member of the committee; through his leadership a school was launched. The committee appointed a faculty of three, with Shetler as principal, and the faculty arranged a course of study as outlined by the Bible Committee. A tuition charge of fifty cents a week per pupil was decided upon, which, with income derived through offerings from individuals and congregations, was to be applied first to general expenses; then all that was left over was divided among the faculty pro rata according to the amount of work done by each. In this way there were no deficits, and the teachers were on the same basis as many Mennonite ministers—supported but not salaried. This plan has been found satisfactory in a number of the winter Bible schools.

The first term of this school was opened on December 13, 1920, at the Hopewell Church near Hubbard, Oregon. Half of the six-week term was held at this church, and, for the convenience of a larger number of students, the other half was held at the Albany church, Albany, Oregon. The total number of different persons in attendance was 115. A Missionary Conference and a Christian Workers' Meeting were held during the term with good attendance.

No school was held the next two winters, but the school spirit was quite strong in the conference district at that time. At the urgent request of many brethren, steps were taken to continue the school under the direction of the Pacific Coast Conference. A four-year course was outlined, covering the following subjects: Bible Introduction, Old Testament History, New Testament History, Religious Pedagogy, Vocal Music, English, Bible Geography, Gospels, Missions, Book Study. The second six-week term was held in 1923-24, half at each of the churches mentioned above. There was no session the following winter, but in 1925 the Conference officially decided to establish a permanent Bible School to be held annually throughout the district as called for. For three winters, 1926-27 to 1928-29, a session was held annually both at Zion church near Hubbard, Oregon, and at the Nampa, Idaho, church. A short course was held at Filer, Idaho, in February, 1929. The school at Nampa, according to Viola Wenger, one of the teachers, "was held more as Bible Normal work with forenoon and evening sessions."

It is to be regretted that this school was discontinued,[52] partly because of a lack of adequate leadership, and partly because more of the young people have taken up regular school work. Shetler wrote that this school "from the very beginning promised to be an important factor in the development of the young people, in the advancing of mission interests, in establishing unity among the brotherhood and between the congregations, in building up members in the faith, and in advancing church loyalty."[53]

Ontario A. M. Bible School. While this is a recent school with but a short history, it is already well developed. In 1932 the matter of a winter Bible school was taken up at the annual meeting of the Ontario A. M. Conference. A Bible School Board was elected for a term of three years to establish and take charge of the school. Its responsibilities included selection of school officials and teachers, and financial arrangements. The president of the Board, and the Principal appointed, together selected and arranged the course of study.

The first session was held for four weeks at the East Zorra Church, Tavistock, Ontario, beginning November 21, 1932. A four-week session has been held annually in this church, usually in the month of January. In the years following the opening of the work at East Zorra, the Ontario A. M. Bible School began to hold additional sessions at other congregations, namely, those near Wellesley, Poole, and Baden, all in Ontario not far from the East Zorra Church. At first each of these sessions was held at a different time, but since 1940 two are held simultaneously, namely at East Zorra and at Steinman's, near Baden.

A six-year cycle of courses has been followed, covering during the six years the following: Old Testament, New Testament (Gospels, Hebrews, Revelation), Epistles, Bible Outline, Bible Doctrine, and Church History. Music and Sunday School Normal were also taught.[54]

Winter Bible School of the Alberta-Saskatchewan Mennonite Conference. Although this is the most recent of the "migratory" conference schools, it is the best developed. It has been enrolling over one fourth of the membership of the conference district.

---

52. Schools have since been held at Sheridan and Hubbard, Oregon, but under local auspices, and not as a continuation of the Conference project.

53. S. G. Shetler, *Church History of the Pacific Coast Mennonite Conference District,* pp. 70-72.

54. Jacob R. Bender, in questionnaire, February, 1941.

The Mission Board of the Alberta Saskatchewan Conference District took the initiative in getting this school started. In 1934 this Board asked C. J. Ramer to serve as teacher, and to submit a plan for a winter Bible school to be held in the conference district. He drew up a plan and submitted it, October 11, 1934. The plan was accepted by the Mission Board, and the matter taken up with Conference in 1935, which also acted favorably on it. The Conference gave the Mission Board the authority to organize and sponsor the school. A Bible Study Committee was elected by the Mission Board to assume more direct oversight. The Mission Board selected the school officials and teacher. C. J. Ramer, the principal chosen, drew up the course of study which covered the Mennonite Elementary Teacher Training Units, Old Testament, New Testament, and practical subjects, in a three-year cycle.

The school opened its first season at Tofield, Alberta, December 31, 1934. A three-week term was held at this place, followed by one at Carstairs, Alberta, and then another at Duchess, Alberta. This arrangement has continued annually. Beginning with 1935-36 a two-week term was also held at Guernsey, Saskatchewan, and since 1937-38 also a two-week term at High River, Alberta. In this way, the conference district has been well covered.[55]

IX

THE CONGREGATIONAL WINTER BIBLE SCHOOLS

The winter Bible schools described in previous chapters were sponsored by a church college or academy, or a district conference, or a mission station. All of these had sufficient organizational strength or special facilities to carry on a school for at least four weeks.

In this section will be considered those winter Bible schools which were sponsored by local congregations or small groups of congregations. These were usually held for not more than two or three weeks. While an attempt at this type of school was made as early as 1914, it has only been during the last decade that these schools began to maintain a continued existence on a somewhat permanent basis.

Information on these schools was secured almost exclusively from replies to questionnaires sent to their secretaries or leaders. The material is organized as follows: Kishacoquillas Valley Bible School,

55. C. J. Ramer, in questionnaires, 1938 and 1941, supplied detailed information.

Iowa Mennonite Bible School, the two-week Bible schools. Inasmuch as these schools are usually called simply Bible schools, this shorter term will be used in this chapter.

Kishacoquillas Valley Bible School. The first session of this school was held at the Amish Mennonite Church near Allensville, Pennsylvania, February 2 to 20, 1914, a total of three weeks. It was largely through the interest and conviction of the local ministry and some of the lay members that the school was started. The home ministers sponsored the school and selected largely local talent for the faculty. The courses taught were: Doctrine, Prophecy, Biblical Introduction, Bible Geography, and Bible History.

It was not until 1924 that another session was held. The term was lengthened to six weeks and a Bible School Board was organized, composed of nine members, who represented the Mennonite churches of Mifflin County, Pennsylvania. A constitution was adopted, which stated that the purpose of the school was to "enlighten our people in the knowledge of God's Word . . ." The ministry now shared with the Board the task of selecting the school staff. J. B. Smith, who had had an active part in the short Bible terms at Hesston, Kansas, and Harrisonburg, Virginia, was secured as principal and teacher. The school continued in this way for four winters, but was then discontinued. An idea of the character of the work done can be gained from a bulletin announcing the term for January and February, 1927. The courses offered seemed to be part of a prescribed curriculum for a number of years, and included Biblical Introduction, Methods of Bible Study, Bible History, Exodus, Mark, Epistles, Bible Geography, Doctrine, Teacher Training, Missions, and Music I and II. Special evening classes on Methods of Bible Study and Music were conducted at a near-by Conservative A. M. church, besides occasional evening lectures at the church where the school was being held. Tuition for the term was nine dollars; board and room, three dollars and fifty cents per week.

In 1933, the school was revived, to continue without interruption to the present (1941). During this period, a systematic cycle of courses was adopted by the Bible School Board, which included courses in the Bible, Bible Geography, Bible Doctrine, Church History, Teacher Training, Missions, and Music. The enrollment averaged about forty. In 1936 the term was reduced from six to three weeks, tuition reduced to three dollars, and board and room offered

free, with the result that attendance increased. The course has been put on a more systematic basis. The principalship has been changed at least four times during this period.

As early as 1924 a "Vacation Bible School" was held during the Christmas vacation for school children. While this was not staffed by the same faculty, it was associated with the regular Bible school work, and represents an interesting enlargement of the scope of the work.

Iowa Mennonite Bible School. On September 4, 1930, the ministerial body of the churches of south-eastern Iowa met for the purpose of considering the advisability of starting a Bible school. "The sentiment was unanimously in favor of such a school," and the bishops of the district were appointed to serve as a committee to arrange for and have oversight of the school.[56] This committee appointed one of their number, Simon Gingerich, as principal, and with him arranged the following course of study: Bible Outline, Bible Geography, Christian Doctrine, Old Testament History, and Vocal Music. The school was held for four weeks, beginning December 29, at the Lower Deer Creek Church, near Kalona, Iowa. Ninety-five students attended, and it was decided to continue the Bible school. The school was held annually, one year at Wayland, with a similar organization and curriculum, but with a decreasing attendance until the close of the 1936 winter term. A four-year cycle of courses had been contemplated in the previous winter, but there was not sufficient interest to continue the school in 1937, so that the cycle was never carried out.

No further sessions of the school were held until the winter of 1940-41, when a two-week Bible school was held. The work was of a more elementary nature, using few textbooks besides the Bible. Teaching was mostly on the lecture style and there were no examinations. Four evening class sessions were held on the same informal plan. The enrollment was higher than any previous year, and consisted entirely of local people.

Two Week Bible Schools. The first of the two-week Bible schools was held at the Central Amish Mennonite Church near Archbold, Ohio, February 20 to March 3, 1933. The aged bishop of this congregation, E. L. Frey, had been attending Johnstown Bible School, and had developed a longing for a Bible school in his home com-

56. *Bulletin of the Bible School to be held at the Lower Deer Creek Church near Kalona, Iowa, December 29, 1930 to January 16, 1931.*

munity, especially to serve those who could not get away from home for six weeks. He took up the matter with the local ministers and counselled with the congregation. A Bible School Committee was organized, consisting of the local bishops, ministers, and deacons.

The principal of the Johnstown Bible School, S. G. Shetler, was secured to act as principal, and it was decided to hold the school for two weeks soon after the close of the Johnstown Bible School. Shetler introduced the six-year cycle of courses that was being followed at Johnstown. This required one of two adjustments in curriculum; either a course that was taught for six weeks at Johnstown would have to be covered in two weeks at Archbold, or it would have to be divided into two or more parts. It was still to be a six-year cycle. The courses taught the first year were: Genesis, Proverbs, Matthew, Romans, James, I John, Bible Characters, Bible Geography, Bible Doctrine, Christian Principles, Christian Growth, Sunday School Pedagogy, Young People's Meeting, and Vocal Music. The tuition charge was seventy-five cents per week, with room and board provided free in the homes of the congregation. A noon meal at the church was also given free. Evening evangelistic meetings were held by the faculty during part of the term. A two-week term was held annually under Shetler's leadership to 1940, with an enrollment of over two hundred at times. The total membership in Fulton County, in which the school was held, and from which most of the students came, was 1,359 in 1941. This meant that the school was annually reaching about one seventh of the membership. Beginning with the winter of 1934-35 the school was held during the last two weeks of December. No school was conducted in 1941.

After the first term at Archbold in 1933, Shetler held evangelistic meetings at the Bowne Mennonite Church near Clarksville, Michigan. The Bible school proposition was discussed and the counsel of the congregation taken. Since this was favorable, T. E. Schrock, a local minister, prepared plans for the school with Shetler. The same curriculum, financial plan, and plan of administration were adopted which were in effect at Archbold. The first session was held during the second and third weeks of December, 1933. A session has been held annually at the same time of the year, until the present time. Shetler served as principal from 1933 to 1937. In 1938 a "School Board" was formed, composed of the local ministry and the Sunday-school superintendents. No important changes were made

in the curriculum or plan of operation of the school. The attendance in this congregation of 105 has been rather uniform, averaging about forty students.

The next two-week Bible schools were organized by Shetler in 1935 at Midland, Michigan, and Leo, Indiana. Their terms began on February 18 and March 4 respectively. Shetler served as principal of both schools until 1940. The instructors held evening evangelistic meetings during the first term at Leo. There were sixty-seven students and twenty-seven converts. The school became permanent, holding annual sessions during the last week of February and the first week of March. The Midland school has also been held annually but at varying times of the season.

In 1935 Shetler discontinued his services as principal of Johnstown Bible School, and devoted the winter of 1935-36 exclusively to the establishing of two-week Bible schools. Besides continuing as leader of the schools at Archbold, Bowne, Midland, and Leo, he was invited to organize and serve as principal of Bible schools at Creston, Montana, held in October; Maple Grove A. M. Church near Atglen, Pennsylvania, December 30 to January 10; Howard-Miami Church, Kokomo, Indiana, January 20 to 31; and Fairview, Michigan, February 3 to 14. All these schools were continued the next winter under Shetler's leadership, with the exception of the school at Kokomo, whose scheduled work was not undertaken because of Shetler's illness. In the following winter, 1937-38, only the Creston school was discontinued and a new school was established with Shetler's assistance at Sheridan, Oregon, with a two-week term beginning November 1. A two-week Bible school was also established by local leadership at Zion church, near Hubbard, Oregon, during the same winter.

In 1938-39, D. A. Yoder and S. G. Shetler opened a new two-week Bible school at the Shore Mennonite Church near Shipshewana, Indiana, beginning the term on December 7. The Berea Mennonite Church, near Montgomery, Indiana, also asked Shetler to come and organize a school there, but since he could not accept, it was organized with other leadership, along the lines laid down by Shetler in other two-week schools. During this winter Shetler held schools at the same places as the previous winter, except at Kokomo, which continued under other leadership. The Sheridan (Oregon), Bible School held a term of four weeks.

In 1939-40, Shetler resumed his services as principal of the Johnstown Bible School. He continued his connections with the Bible schools of the Archbold, Maple Grove, and Shore congregations. All the others continued, except the school at Sheridan, under other leadership. During the winter of 1940-41, the following two-week Bible schools were held: Archbold, Bowne, Leo, Maple Grove, Fairview, Zion (Hubbard, Oregon), Midland, and Shore (Shipshewana, Indiana).

In all these schools, Shetler's six-year cycle of courses has been basically followed, with minor modifications. In 1934 the Elementary Teacher Training courses outlined by the Mennonite General Sunday School Committee were included in the cycle in such a way that the Elementary Teacher Training diploma could be obtained by attending three two-week terms. As early as 1935 a "junior department" (a week of courses for children of school age) was introduced by Shetler, and has since been offered in the following schools: Archbold, Midland, Leo, Creston, and Fairview. At Archbold this was convenient, since the term was held during the school vacation. But at the others it was accomplished by holding the two daily sessions of the school in the morning and in the evening, so that the children could be present for the latter. At Fairview the school is held in the afternoon and evening. The Shore Mennonite Bible School held morning, afternoon, and evening sessions for the first time in December, 1940, but had no junior department. However, a younger student age-group was thereby reached, presumably those attending high school.[57]

X

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS

A Brief Review. The short-term winter Bible school originated as a short course at a church academy, Elkhart Institute (now Goshen College). Besides having found a permanent place in our church schools, it has also become established by conference districts and congregations. In this it was but a successor to the Bible Confer-

57. Shetler, interviewed by writer, February 1, 1941; announcements in *Gospel Herald,* XXIX, 576; XXXI, 519. Information for this section was also derived from replies to questionnaires by the following for their respective schools. F. F. Bontrager, 1938, Midland Bible School; I. G. Kennel, 1938 and 1941, Maple Grove Bible School; N. M. Slabaugh, 1938, 1941, Kokomo Mennonite Bible School; Menno Esch, 1941, Fairview Bible School; Earley Bontrager, 1941, Shore Mennonite Bible School; E. P. Shrock, 1941, Berea Mennonite Bible School.

ences, Bible Normals, and Bible Instruction Meetings so popular in the Mennonite Church during the first two decades of the twentieth century. Central winter Bible schools, held by church schools and district conferences, have had terms of at least six weeks; local congregational schools have had only two- or three-week terms. These schools have served chiefly those who were employed on the farm or in other occupations which they could leave for a few weeks. The Mennonite Church has long been predominantly rural, but it is gradually being affected by the urbanization of America. As a result there has been an increase in the number and in the enrollment of evening classes in winter Bible schools. This trend will now be illustrated, first, in the history of the most recent winter Bible school, the Mennonite Bible School of Lancaster Conference, and second, in the growth of the evening class movement. The Lancaster school is also a good illustration of the growth of the evening class movement.

The Mennonite Bible School of Lancaster Conference. The Lancaster Conference is the largest and one of the oldest Mennonite district conferences in America, but it has been slow to undertake organized educational activities. However, a number of its young people attended winter Bible schools in other conferences. One of the Lancaster bishops, Noah H. Mack, had been a special Bible term instructor for a number of years at Eastern Mennonite School, Harrisonburg, Virginia.

The matter of a Bible school in the conference district was discussed privately by interested individuals. It was brought to the executive committee of the Lancaster Conference (the Bishop Board) by an interested bishop. Various ideas were clarified and action was taken approving the establishment of Bible school work. The executive committee in turn submitted their proposal to Conference. At its spring session, April 8, 1938, Conference voted approval and a Bible School Committee of three was appointed to study and report on the problem. During the summer the committee sent a number of questionnaires to representative persons in the conference. On the basis of the returns, the Bible School Committee together with the executive committee of conference agreed upon the form that the school should take. Later the Bible School Committee was continued as the Bible School Board of Lancaster Conference to assume responsibility for the school.

The former church building of the Ephrata Mennonite Congregation was remodeled for school purposes. Paul Graybill was chosen principal and other officials and teachers selected. The principal with the Bible School Board drew up a course of study. The curriculum proposed provided for a three-year cycle of courses covering the entire Bible, Church History, Bible Doctrines, and Bible Geography. Two courses in music and the six units of the Mennonite Elementary Teacher Training Course were to be offered annually. A special feature of the curriculum was that certain of these courses were regarded as more advanced than others and were to be taken by older students or by those who had previous training or experience in the study of the Bible. This was a decided forward step in the construction of winter Bible school curricula, and was taken up by at least one other school the following year.

The first term was held in the remodeled church building in Ephrata from January 3 to February 10, 1939. A six-week term was again held at the beginning of 1940 and of 1941. The curriculum was followed essentially as planned, except that too few students registered for several of the courses to form classes. A few other courses not mentioned above were offered, namely: Bible Introduction, Distinctive Principles of the Mennonite Church, Personal Evangelism, and Christian Evidences.

Extra-curricular features included special religious lectures on Wednesday evenings and occasionally during the school week. A few periods were set aside each week for discussion groups in which vital problems of young people were considered under a capable leader.

But the most distinctive feature of the work of this school was its effort to reach persons who could not find time to attend the daily sessions. Twice during each term a Friday evening and Saturday all day were devoted to "Week-End Bible Studies." By this plan students could choose to take any four out of a total of sixteen or eighteen lecture courses, each meeting two or three times.

Arrangements were also made for evening classes meeting on Tuesday and Thursday evenings. The first year only two courses were offered. These were Units I and IV of the Elementary Teacher Training Course. The response was so good that in the following year, Units I, II, IV, and V were offered besides three Bible courses and a course in Bible Doctrines. In 1941 ten different courses were

offered, from which the student could choose two. Evening classes for ministers were also offered on the same evenings.[58]

The Evening Class Movement. The first winter Bible school to hold evening classes was the Ontario Mennonite Bible School, which held evening classes at least occasionally from its beginning. The Hesston Special Bible Term ran one of its courses in the evening the first year. But these earlier courses seem to have been lecture courses for the general public, without thought of credit. It is only in recent years that one finds evidence that the evening work was a definite part of the regular work of the school. After 1935 some of the two-week Bible schools began to hold part of their daily sessions in the evening to make at least some of the courses available to those unable to attend during the day. While these evening students could not all take the forenoon or afternoon courses, their work was just as definite as the rest, and, if systematically pursued, yielded equal credit.

The Mennonite Bible School of Lancaster Conference is located in an area where many Mennonite young people are no longer employed on the farm. Already in 1939, during the first term, the evening school had a larger enrollment than the day school. This condition has not been reversed since, but instead the enrollment in the day school has decreased, while evening enrollment has increased.

A similar condition exists in the Southwestern Pennsylvania Conference District. The enrollment in the regular work of the Johnstown Bible School has been slowly declining for the last ten years. Evening classes were introduced in 1940, and again held in 1941. While enrollment in the evening school has not yet exceeded that in the day school, it has almost doubled while the day school enrollment has continued to decline.

The popularity of the evening courses in the Lancaster Conference no doubt led to the opening of an evening Bible school in a neighboring Amish Mennonite church, the Conestoga A. M. Church, near Morgantown, Pennsylvania. Classes were held every Tuesday and Thursday evening for six weeks, beginning March 4, 1941. Two courses were offered under Noah Good, who had been a teacher in the Lancaster Conference school at Ephrata. While this type of school is not within the province of this study, it is significant as a trend in the winter Bible school movement.

---

58. J. P. Graybill, in interview, January 11, 1941, and special bulletins, *Mennonite Bible School of Lancaster Conference,* 1939, 1940, 1941.

The evening Bible study movement has reached its greatest strength in the Franconia Conference district (in suburban southeastern Pennsylvania), where it began in 1932. In the winter of 1940-41 this district had evening Bible study classes in seven congregations with a total average attendance of over one thousand.[59] This included over three hundred fifty children of school age and under, over two hundred young people of high school age and over, and perhaps five hundred adults, all of whom were being taught a systematic course of study. Of the adults eighty-eight received certificates for writing out definite weekly assignments for the twenty or more weeks for which the classes were held.[60]

XI

GROWTH AND PRESENT STATUS OF THE WINTER BIBLE SCHOOLS IN THE MENNONITE CHURCH

Growth. The writer was fortunate in being able to obtain enrollment statistics for most of the schools covering the entire period since their establishment. From a number of sources[61] the accompanying table was compiled, showing the growth in the winter Bible school enrollment, as also the increase in the number of schools. If the enrollment for any school was not reported for a given winter, but the school was known to have held a session, this fact is shown by use of an asterisk. If there was definitely no session, this is indicated by "ns" (no session).

---

59. The total Sunday School enrollment was 6,107.

60. Based on approximate figures secured by letter or interview from the following leaders of these classes: John E. Lapp, J. C. Clemens, W. R. Moyer, Jacob Landis, Elmer Kolb, and Wilson Overholt.

61. Specific sources for the attendance statistics of the winter Bible schools: a. GOSHEN: I. E. Burkhart, in letter, April 4, 1941. b. ONTARIO: for 1907, (which includes evening enrollment), L. J. Burkholder, in *Gospel Witness*, II, 749; for 1911-1932, S. F. Coffman, personal records; for 1932-40, J. B. Martin. c. HESSTON: for 1910, *Gospel Herald*, II, 680; 1912, *Report of Hesston Academy Administration to Mennonite Board of Education;* for 1913-1938, Paul Erb; for 1939-1941, Milo Kaufman, d. CANTON: *Gospel Herald*, V, 712; X, 776; XII, 884; average attendance given by I. W. Royer. e. ALTOONA: J. L. Stauffer. f. KISHACOQUILLAS VALLEY: Average enrollment given by U. S. Zook. g. EASTERN MENNONITE SCHOOL: for 1915 and 1916, *Gospel Herald*, VII, 705; VIII, 672; for 1917-1941, Melvin Ruth. h. DAKOTA-MONTANA: Floyd E. Kaufman; average given by J. C. Gingerich, 1938. i. PACIFIC COAST: S. G. Shetler, *History of Pacific Coast Mennonite Conference*. j. JOHNSTOWN: S. G. Shetler. k. IOWA: J. Y. Swartzendruber. l. ONTARIO A. M.: J. R. Bender. m. ARCHBOLD: S. G. Shetler. n. BOWNE: T. E. Shrock. o. ALBERTA-SASKATCHEWAN: C. J. Ramer. p. MIDLAND, LEO, and CRESTON: S. G. Shetler. q. MAPLE GROVE: I. G. Kennel. r. KOKOMO: N. M. Slabaugh. s. FAIRVIEW: Menno Eash. t. SHORE: Earley Bontrager. u. BEREA: E. P. Shrock. v. LANCASTER: J. P. Graybill.

	1899-00	1900-01	1901-02	1902-03	1903-04	1904-05	1905-06	1906-07	1907-08	1908-09	1909-10	1910-11	1911-12	1912-13	1913-14	1914-15	1915-16	1916-17	1917-18	1918-19	1919-20	1920-21
Goshen	20	22	23	24	36	40	15	41	48	30	22	40	31	31	34	26	32	30	20	13	18	19
Ontario	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	c65	*	ns	*	19‡	17‡	52	38	39	39	32	26	29	46	46
Ontario (eve)	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	*	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	16	..	20	..	17
Hesston	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	16	14	13	17	15	20	33	24	51	49	60	42
Canton	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	c25	ns	*	ns	ns	31	45	*	*
Kishacoq. Valley	..	.	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	*	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
Altoona	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	18	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
E. M. S.	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	48	71	68	49	31	84	66
Dak.-Mont.	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	*	*
Pacific Coast	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	115
Johnstown	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Johnstown (eve)	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Lima	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Iowa	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Iowa (eve)	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Ontario A. M.	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Archbold	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Bowne	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Alta.-Sask.	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Midland	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Leo	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Creston	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Maple Grove	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Kokomo	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Fairview	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Sheridan	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Zion	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Lagrange Co. (Shore)	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Lagrange Co. (eve)	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Berea	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Lancaster	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Lancaster (eve)	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Known total no. of schools	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	1	3	3	3	4	4	6	4	4	5	5	6	7
Known total enrollment		22	23	24	36	40	15	106	48	30	38	73	61	125	87	151	175	154	177	167	208	288
Estimated total enrollment	20	22	23	24	36	40	15	106	48	30	55	73	61	125	125	190	175	170	177	167	270	350
Same plus eve. enrollment	20	22	23	24	36	40	15	106	48	30	55	73	61	125	125	190	175	170	177	187	270	367

"*" a session held, but enrollment unknown.
"ns" no session.
"‡" means plus.
"c" for circa, meaning "about."

	1921-22	1922-23	1923-24	1924-25	1925-26	1926-27	1927-28	1928-29	1929-30	1930-31	1931-32	1932-33	1933-34	1934-35	1935-36	1936-37	1937-38	1938-39	1939-40	1940-41	Total no. sessions	Average annual enrollment
Goshen	15	12	ns	32	53	20	17	24	27	21	11	29	36	33	50	74	89	83	104	91	41	35
Ontario	31	30	22	37	64	102	158	120	118	141	160	115	107	148	203	172	180	224	174	141	34	84
Ontario (eve)	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	*	*	*	*	178	179	143	..	..
Hesston	19	23	19	15	24	31	24	15	19	18	16	56	71	73	85	94	100	82	74	73	32	44
Canton	*	ns	ns	*	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	27	33	41	11	c30
Kishacoq. Valley	ns	ns	ns	*	*	*	*	..	..	..	..	..	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	12‡	c40
Altoona	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	1	18
E. M. S.	48	49	63	53	41	53	103	67	96	63	44	66	95	101	84	111	123	79	77	86	27	71
Dak.-Mont.	*	*	*	ns	ns	*	ns	ns	*	ns	*	18	33	24	28	50	27	20	41	41	17‡	c25
Pacific Coast	ns	54	ns	ns	41	*	*	*	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	6	..
Johnstown	26	30	48	53	60	70	86	82	61	76	76	68	62	68	63	38	60	48	53	48	20	59
Johnstown (eve)	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	16	29	2	c22
Lima	..	..	..	..	..	30	*	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	2	c35
Iowa	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	95	71	37	31	28	47	ns	ns	ns	108	7	60
Iowa (eve)	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	32	1	32
Ontario A. M.	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	52	55	63	45	53	44	49	42	49	9	50
Archbold	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	*	*	*	*	*	242	217	253	160	9	178‡
Bowne	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	45	34	38	39	41	35	40	36	8	30
Alta.-Sask.	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	118	120	105	162	164	183	172	7	146
Midland	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	116	*	107	*	132	*	*	7	100‡
Leo	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	67	78	81	*	51	*	*	7	c70
Creston	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	34	46	ns	ns	ns	ns	2	40
Maple Grove	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	218	181	195	223	184	193	6	199
Kokomo	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	75	ns	80	60	30	ns	4	61
Fairview	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	105	114	110	198	77	85	6	98
Sheridan	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	75	65	ns	ns	2	70
Zion	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	*	*	*	100	4	c65
Lagrange Co. (Shore)	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	103	100	72	3	92
Lagrange Co. (eve)	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	36	..	..
Berea	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	22	24	ns	2	23
Lancaster	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	75	67	57	3	63
Lancaster (eve)	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	85	111	99	..	..
Known total no. of schools	7	7	5	7	7	9	8	6	6	5	7	9	11	14	18	17	18	22	21	20	..	..
Known total enrollment	139	198	152	190	283	306	388	308	321	319	402	475	541	775	1254	1312	1528	1977	1556	1381	..	..
Estimated total enrollment	200	225	175	270	320	430	500	330	350	319	425	650	750	1000	1600	1575	1780	2075	1825	1730	..	..
Same plus eve. enrollment	200	225	175	270	320	430	500	330	350	319	425	650	750	1120	1730	1720	1930	2238	2100	2070	..	..

Some of the schools reported the average annual enrollment instead of reporting enrollment year by year, and a few of the schools gave no reports at all. Approximate figures were obtained for some of these. The estimated total annual enrollment was computed by adding these average annual enrollment figures to the known total annual enrollment and calculating to the nearest round number. Enrollment for evening classes was recorded separately where possible, where it represented part-time students not enrolled in the day school. The average annual enrollment was computed to the nearest whole number. Conservative estimates were used. This may account for the difference between the total estimated enrollment here given for 1939 and that given by S. G. Shetler in the *Mennonite Year Book and Directory*. He estimated a total enrollment of over two thousand but he included schools among the Conservative Amish Mennonites and may also have included part-time evening students.

From Table I it can be observed that the most rapid growth both in enrollment and number of schools occurred during the last decade. This was in part due to the activity of S. G. Shetler in establishing the two-week congregational Bible schools described earlier. However, there were also increases in the older schools, especially those held at the church colleges which had been adversely affected by the depression.

Present Extent. In questionnaires sent to leaders and secretaries, information was requested on the area reached by each school. On the basis of the returns, it will be possible to determine how large a part of the Mennonite Church is served by these schools.

As was shown in Table I, there were twenty winter Bible schools in session in 1939-40, and an additional one in 1940-41. These twenty-one schools may be classified as follows:

1. Six-week schools held at church schools: Goshen W. B. S., Hesston W. B. S., Eastern Mennonite School S. B. T.
2. Twelve-week conference schools: Ontario M. B. S.
3. Six-week conference schools: Johnstown B. S., Lancaster M. B. S.
4. Migratory conference schools, held from two to six weeks in each location: Dakota-Montana W. B. S., Ontario A. M. B. S., Alberta Saskatchewan W. B. S.
5. Six-week conjoint congregational schools: Kishacoquillas Valley B. S., Canton B. S.

6. Two-week conjoint congregational schools: Iowa M. B. S. Archbold (Fulton County) B. S., Shore M. B. S.

7. Two-week local congregational schools: Bowne B. S., Midland B. S., Leo B. S., Maple Grove B. S., Kokomo B. S., Fairview B. S., Berea M. B. S.

As was shown in the histories of these schools, the majority were sponsored by a Bible School Board or Bible School Committee. This represented the entire conference, a group of congregations, or the local congregation, depending on the type of school. However, a few local schools were sponsored by the local ministerial body. The winter Bible schools held in the church schools were in charge of the administrations of those schools, which were in turn responsible to a Board of Education representing a large portion of the church.

The increase in both the number of winter Bible schools and their total enrollment has been rather steady during the forty-one years in which these schools have existed in the Mennonite Church. The growth in enrollment has been especially remarkable during the last decade. From 1901 to 1932 enrollment rose slowly from about twenty to a little over four hundred. Since 1932 it has risen until it has reached an estimated two thousand (1940-41). This phenomenal increase has been due in large part to the increase in the number of two-week local Bible schools, although the older schools have continued to grow steadily also.

At the present time there is at least one winter Bible school in or near every Mennonite conference district but the Pacific Coast Conference District. The Indiana-Michigan, and the Ohio and Eastern A. M. Conference Districts have a number of two-week local Bible schools besides the centrally located six-week schools within their respective districts. The older six-week and twelve-week schools with arrangements for boarding students draw students from quite a distance, thus serving a widely scattered constituency. Three conference Bible schools move about in the conference to reach more of their membership. From all this we conclude that the winter Bible schools have come to serve a large part of the Mennonite constituency and are filling a large part in the life of this denomination.

Author's Note: The study of Mennonite Winter Bible Schools was undertaken at the suggestion of Dean H. S. Bender of Goshen College in connection with a course in Mennonite History, and completed as a part of the requirements for the degree of Master in Religious Education at the Eastern Baptist Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, Pa.